

Sapientia Justificata,

OR,

A Vindication of the
fifth Chapter to the

R O M A N S:

And therein of the Glory of the
Divine Attributes, and that in the
Question or Case of *Original Sin*, a-
gainst any way of Erroneous under-
standing it, whether old or new.

More especially an Answer to

-Dr. *Jeremy Taylors*

DEUS JUSTIFICATUS,

By *John Gaule*, Minister of great *Staughton*
in the County of *Huntingdon*.

L O N D O N,

Printed for *N. Paris*, and *Tho. Dring*,
and are to be sold at the *George* in *Little Brit-*
tain, and at the *George* in *Fleetstreet*, near
St. Dunstons Church. 1657. -

Dicitis nos asserendo Peccatum originale
— Deum crimine iniquitatis arguer
— Nos ergo dicimus, nec iniquus est Deus
cum peccatis sive originalibus sive propriis
digna retribuit, magisque aut iniquus, au
infirmus ostenditur, si jugum graue su
per filios Adam à die (sicut scriptum est)
natiuitatis eorum, usque in diem sepulture
in matre omnium; sub quo iugo Imago ejus
attingitur, aut ipse (nullo originali vel pro
prio precedente peccato) aut quilibet alius
ipso imponit invito. — Deus autem justus
tanta parvulis mala (quanta nunc dicer
non sufficio) nihil peccati trahentibus irro
gerat, magis appareret injustus. Aug
cont. Julian : Pelagian. lib. X.

#129
Friedrich 12/1/13
St
(over)



*To his much honoured and
most worthy Friend*

JOHN BALDVVIN

Esquire.

Noble Sir,



Ow oft, how
much in our seri-
ous discourses up-
on more than one
of this Authors
works, have we honoured

A 2

him

him for his learning ; affected him for his piety ; admired him for his industry ; applauded him for his eloquence ; and condoling him , pitied his sufferings , among many other godly and learned men his like ? and thereupon it was that we studiously laboured , not so much to reconcile within our selves many a particular phrase and passage (dispersed here and there) seeming not only to be borrowed from , but as bordering too much upon the expressions , if not opinions of the *Inorthodox* ; but rather to salve them up to others understandings , who began to take more scandal at them ,
than

than we our selves did ; and
this we endeavoured in a can-
did interpretation of his inten-
tion , as one who meant only
to make use of the Adversaries
manner of speaking to no other
purpose , but to cause (I say
not his, but) their forms and
affectations to speak (as near
as possibly could be) to the te-
nor of the *Orthodox Truth* and
Faith in general , and to that of
the *Church of England* in more e-
special.

But truly, Sir, this little piece
of his, which you were lately
pleased to send me ; puts me ut-
terly to a loss ; and sets me so
quite beyond the seeking for
an excuse ; that it forces me alto-

gether to fall upon a dissent. I could heartily have wish'd, that instead of answering his Friends (learned Friends) objection, he would rather have sate down by their advice; For were the thing that he principally aims at, true, yet was it not so necessary to be brought to light, especially not under the notion of a charge or challenge; For he may well assure himself all the reformed Divines (men *Orthodox* and moderate, both for *Doctrine* and *Discipline*) cannot chose but take themselves stricken at through the *Presbyterians* sides: And therefore, notwithstanding he entitles it (*Deus justificatus*)

thus) against them only : yet I am much afraid he will not therein prove *Homo justificandus*, neither in their judgement, nor of many others, and they his friends and fellow workers, and fellow-sufferers too, whether more or less made known unto him.

And now { judicious Sir } though your own judgement (both in Divinity, and for other good learning) be such as come short to few of your quality ; and so well known (as I need not speak) to the Gentlemen of your Countrey and others ; yet forasmuch as I am your Minister, I know you expect my mind : for therefore

I received it at your hand,
And verily I shall (by Gods
Grace)dissemble it neither with
him,nor you; yet I would have
both him and you think,I dare
not presume to propound any
thing here upon my own
mind alone, but as I am ena-
bled to goe along with the
Scriptures and the Church of
God: Because it is a hard
matter in (such a hard
point as this of Original Sin)
for a man to goe alone, and
not to erre. Neverthelesse I
know (through the gift of
God) a man may be enabled
and enlarged to speak newer
and clearer; but then he must
be sure that his ground for the

Point

Point be old, and good, For it is
a *Fanaticism* for any man to con-
ceit that God concealed such a
main Principle of his Truth
from his whole Church, till
now that he revealed it to
himself alone.

ye
th
ou
ph
To
an
th
ro
th



A
VINDICATION
OF THE
Fifth Chapter
TO THE
ROMANS.



First let me begin with his Title and his Scope, & compare them both together, that so we may see how answerable they are each to other; For let me tell you, Sir, (and you shall observe it in all the ridiculous, senseless, fanatical factious, heretical and blasphemous Pamphlets of these our evil days) that fair Titles are taken up only to palliate false and foul intents, neither is there any shorter or surer way of refuting an Error, than in searching directly how all the intended scribbling agrees little or

nothing with the pretended superscription. For let truths be spoken, yet they are not so there, unless they be according to the main purpose to which they are intituled. This Authors Title or superscription is (*Deus justificatus*) now I pray God it prove so the whole work throughout; For I greatly suspect that the main intention of this discourse will but work to frustrate the title that is given to it, because I perceive his principal Scope and Conclusion is, to make Original sin to be a sin so called by a *Metonymie* only, for he very often denies it to be a sin, properly, really, formally, and inherently, and contends mainly to have it no more but a *Metonymical Imputation* to certain purposes, which are very involved words, and are so studiously covert, as if he were afraid or ashamed to speak plainly outright. But this is as much as to say, That where Original sin is called sin, it is not so literally and properly, but only is called so (by a figurative form of locution) by a *Metonymie* of the cause for the effect, namely, sin put only for the punishment of sin, and the imputation of this sin by God, is no more, but the infliction of the punishment.

nishment; And this punishment is with limitation to certain purposes, and those purposes are no further, but to Temporal misery and Death. Gather all these together, and you shall so come to plain speaking, *viz.* That Original sin is no such thing, but hath only the name or appellation of sin in a translated sense, but directly it is either no sin, or another, and not ours. And therefore the Divine imputation is not of the guilt and corruption to us, but all is an infliction only of the punishment and suffering on us, yet so as that it is confined to a temporal death: If this be not the summary drift, let the whole book speak, but if this make to the Title, now give me leave to speak. How invective is this Vindicator of the Divine Attributes against the Sublapsarians, and yet, (this I'll say for them) they doe not, they dare not include any under the severe Decree of the Divine Justice, till they have considered all as born under the lapse and guilt, and defection and infection of Original sin; Whereas he himself will not have Original sin e much as properly so called, neither will he have any to be so considered unless

the Iſaſe as really under the guilt or fault; yet notwithstanding he will have the Divine Imputation or Decree to deſcend even upon all, for matter of Temporal infliction. Now judge whether of theſe two Sentences or Executions can more prejudice or impeach the Divine attributes of Juſtice, Wiſdom, Goodneſs, &c. *viz.* That of Gods imputing the whole and utter puniſhment unto ſome, together with the real imputation of the ſin, or that of Gods imputing but part of the puniſhment, even unto All; and that without any real imputation of the ſin at all? Certainly the Divine Juſtice is made to labour more under this charge for puniſhing all (though but Temporally) where he takes none to be faulty; than it can under that for puniſhing but ſome (although eternally) where it finds all guilty. Thus forcing at his own aim, and yet, forgetting the mark prefixed, he miſerably impinges upon the ſame Rock himſelf, which he would inſinuate others for to daſh upon.

Would he verily and indeed have vindicated the glory of the Divine attributes in the queſtion of Original ſin, he ſhould

should not have proposed to do it only against the Presbyterian way of understanding it, (who had they no more disturbed the wholsom Discipline of the Church of *England*, than they have of late directly publicly, and with one consent) opposed her in her sound Doctrine, she had never been thus widowed to such disorder and distress, but might have sat still a Queen of Reformed Churches, flourishing in her Peace and Truth; Neither will they all yield, that their way of understanding it should ever be pointed out for a way apart, or singular from the Church of *England*, and other Reformed Churches, but he should rather have taken such a kind of Vindication in hand as against the Pelagian, the Manichean, the Samosatenean, the Socinian, the Pontifician, the Pighian, the Flaccian, the Arminian, the Supralapsarian; yea the Judaical, the Philosophical, the Scholastical, the Synergistical, and the Anabaptistical way of understanding it; all which Hereticks and Sectaries have here (would a man goe about to make an exact Catalogue or Computation) in more than sixteen times sixteen famous (that

is infamous) questions, opinions, errors, trench'd too palpably and grossly upon the glory of the Divine attributes indeed. As, be pleased to take here a taste. What but their own way of understanding it caused the Jews to run into some error about Original sin? as that some are born in sin, and others not; again, that some are wholly so born, and others but in part, else how is it they say, *Thou wast altogether born in sin?* Ioh. 9. 34. objecting this scornfully to another in an Exemption of and difference to themselves? and again, That a Typical, a legal or an external Covenant was sufficient to free them from it, without the truth of Christ, and his Gospel of Grace, otherwise, why said they within themselves, *We have Abraham to our Father?* Mat. 3. 9. and boasted before others, *We be Abrahams seed, we be not born of Fornication,* Ioh. 8. 33, 41. and why doth Christ (in convincing them) bring them to the Original of sin? *Ye are of your Father the Devil, and the lusts of your Father ye will doe, for he was a Murderer from the beginning,* &c. v. 44. if Original sin was not here intended? What but their way of understanding it induced

ced the Heathen Philosophers, some to extol Nature as a noble Mother, and simply vertuous, some to depress her as an obscure step-dame, and absolutely vicious; Some to lament at the immerited evils of birth; some to laugh that it should be thought a man could be born with any vice or crime about him? for this was part of that which unto the Greeks seemed foolishness, 1 *Corinth.*

1. 23. That one should be saved by another mans merits, that one should be just with another mans righteousness, that one should suffer and satisfie for another mans offences, and that one should be accounted wicked for another mans sins; And in very deed, the Greeks seeking after wisdom, or men curiously Philosophizing and labouring in the Objections and answers of natural reason, hath been the main thing that hath invented and maintained all the opinions and errors about Original sin; Neither in truth is this natural reasoning of men any other than every mans own way of understanding it. But let us goe on to take further notice of what notorious errors (or heresies rather) that have been not only broached but stilly main-

tained thereby (*scilicet*) that Original
 sin, name, and thing, is nothing. That
 no sin from *Adams* passes upon Men ei-
 ther at their conception, or at their
 birth, neither so much as imputed to po-
 sterity, that *Adams* sin hurt none but
 himself, and that Infants are born in the
 same state *Adam* was in before his
 pravarication. That no man is lyable to
 damnation because of *Adams* sin. That
Adams sin passes no other way upon his
 Posterity but by example or imitation
 only. That Original sin is not remitted
 to Infants by Baptism, because there is
 no such thing in them; so the *Pelagians*,
 and *Cœlestians*. That sins (both O-
 riginal and actual) were created by an
 evil Principle, that is an evil God.
 That no sin is caused by Freewill, but
 by the evil Principle aforesaid, That sin
 is the very nature and substance of Man.
 That some were so born in sin that
 Christ could not save them; so the *Ma-
 nichæes*. That Original sin is in no sort
 to be ascribed unto Man, but either to
 God, or else to the Devil; so the *Her-
 mogenisians*, and *Valentinians*. That O-
 riginal sin is the least of all sins. That
 it is in the Body, and not in the Soul,
 or

or that it is in the inferiour faculties of the Soul only, and not in the superiour. That Original sin is called sin *equivocally, abusively, figuratively*, or by a *Metonymie*, either as the Cause of sin, or as caused by sin. That after Baptism it is no real viciosity, but only a penalty. That the whole, and all of it, is not only not imputed, and remitted, but quite taken away and blotted out by Baptism. That Concupiscence remaining in the regenerate is no sin. That there is no Law against the loss of Original righteousness. That notwithstanding the worst of Original sin, there will remain in us much both moral, civil, pious, and Spiritual good. That it is only a guilt binding over to punishment, but no fault of sin properly defiling, so the *Pontificians*, and especially their *Scholasticks*. That it is neither defection, depravation, corruption, nor truly and properly a Sin, but only an affliction or punishment descending upon posterity through the guilt of *Adams transgression*, like as to be born a Slave or a Bastard is his shame only, and not his sin. That nothing was born in us, and with us which was not good, and the very work of God. That

Adams disobedience was in no wise ours, neither were we therefore in any wise obnoxious to eternal death; so the *Pigbians* and the *Catharinians*. That we become infected by Original sin, not by way of Generation or Propagation, but only by way of imitation and outward occasion. That the death of the body is the sequel of Nature, and no punishment for sin whether original or actual; so the *Socinians* and *Racovians*. That Original sin is not a vicious accident or adjunct, but is become our very Nature, Essence, and Substance; the very heart, and flesh, and body, and soul; so the *Flaccians*, and *Substantialists*. That a mans meer pure naturals (notwithstanding the *Fall*) are good and perfect. That Original sin is but like a little spot upon the skin, or light wound, for all which there remain still in a man his natural capacities, dispositions, powers, and forces to Good. That Men from their Mothers womb, are as fully endowed with *Liberty* and *Freewill*, as *Adam* was before his fall. That *Original sin* to a mans *Freewill*, is but like *Garlick* to a *Leadstone*, easily wipt off, and so it falls to work as fresh as at the first.

first. That the *Adamic* will, or will from *Adams* fall, hath it self not merely passive in the act of *Conversion*; but is thereunto actively cooperating together with God; so the *Erasmians*, the *Su-nergists*, and *Arminians*. That Original sin was but *St. Augustus* dream and *Puppet*. That Infants under the *New Testament* are not born in Original sin. That there's no necessity to baptize Infants, with respect to any benefit they thus can have against it. That Original sin and all other is to be remedied only by *revelations* and *raptures* of the Spirit, without any use either of *Word* or *Sacraments*; so the *Swenckfeldians*, the *Enthousiasts*, *Anabaptists*, *Fanatics*, and *Familists*. That Original sin is not properly a *sin*, but a *Disease*, or a *Condition*, or else figurative form of speaking (viz. by a *Metonymie*) may be so called; so *Zwinglius*, and some of the *Zwinglians*. That God reprobates, God damns men absolutely because it is his will and pleasure, without any respect or condition whether of Original or Actual sin; so the *Supralapsarians*. Thus you see, Sir, what a crowd of Errors have obtruded only through mens leaning to their

own

own understandings, amongst which, more than once, this Author may find his own, which to me (at first view) seems so like to diverse of the aforesaid Errors, that taken up in strict syllables, I began to suspect it would not only appear so, but appear so, and much more. But I look not upon him in a likeness to them, but in some unlikenesse to the *Holy Scriptures*, and the *Church of England*, taking his way of understanding it to be another, both to what the first reaches to understand, and in what the last would be understood. And let him not think I speak this as one that would revile him, but as one that (according to his understanding) must dissent from him, using my *liberty* (which I wish may be mutual) but keeping my *Charity* nevertheless; my understanding I doe faithfully, and in all humility submit to those two witnessses, neither will I oppose him in any thing but what I receive from them (they that will undertake him in other passages, that fall not directly within this compass, let them do it as they shall find themselves concerned in it, or called to it.) This I take to be the safest way to begin, and (if he will

the 5 Chapter of the Romans. 13

will keep his own word) the readiest way to make an end. For taking the 5 Chapter to the *Romans* to be objected against him ; *If it be so* (saies he) *I have done*, if it be not so (say I) I have nothing to do. Let me be beleev'd both by him and you in this : I have look'd again and again upon his Paraphrase with a single eye, only to find out truth, and proper truth, if there explained, hoping he will doe likewise with this *Exposition*, when it shall come to his sight ; *In which* (I make his own words mine) *if I use any violence I can easily be reprov'd.*

For

For the Scripture.

Rom. 5. 12. *Wherefore as by one Man Sin entred into the world, and Death by Sin, and so Death passed upon all Men, for that all have sinned.*



la ruto, Wherefore, therefore, for this cause] I begin with the search and examination of the letter, for it is the Grammatical sifting, that must render the plain Construction, and then the *Rhetorical glossing* may come in to adorn with a certain circumlocution; and therefore a broad *Paraphrase* if it be not unsuitable, yet it is untimely, when it shall presume in place, before a narrower *Exposition* have done its part. *For this cause*, so I am bold to render it, because I find it mostly so rendred in this Epistle to the Ro-

mans, chap. 1. 26. and 13. 6. and 15. 9. which very inference serves to shew plainly the principal reason or cause why it pleased God to permit the *Entrance and Passage* of Original Sin, viz. For this cause, even for the *reconciliation and attonements* sake immediately before spoken of, vers: 10. and 11. Therefore God suffered this sin to enter into the world, The *Enmity*, or hainous aversion, the wrath or dreadfull desert of Original Sin can never be more truly and fully considered and measured than in and by *Christs death and satisfaction*, which who so contends to lessen either for *Fault or Guilt*, such endeavours to extenuate the vertue and merits of *Christs reconciling and attoning*. Gods great end in the *Fall* was to manifest and magnifie the infinite perfection of his own *Son*; who then would not labour earnestly, that Wisdom might principally be justified in the point? Doth not God herein commend his love towards us, vers. 8. How then can we imagin there should be the least prejudice upon the Divine Attributes in such an Ordination or Permission, upon such a motive or intention?

But

But was this inferential motive heedlessly escaped or not rather purposely pretermitted to usurp a more uncontroled licence in the wanton dalliances of words, that I may not call them petulancies of prophanation? *It is no reputation to a Physician to say he hath cured us of an Evil which we never had, and shall we accuse the Father of mercies to have wounded us for no other reason, but that his Son may have the honour to have cured us? I understand not that; he that makes a necessity that he may find a remedy, is like,* &c. The sufficiency and excellency of our Saviour (in this case) is a thing that both he and we all are bound to understand and seriously believe, and not only that, but Gods ordination and dispensation to such an end, as the manifestation of his honour and glory: But why such playing with a thing so sacred? As here's nothing to provoke his spleen to indignation, from an horrible decree of absolute necessitating and damning; so neither can I see any thing that should move it to laughter or levity; the Apostle himself defines what affection it is that should hence be raised, *We joy in God through our Lord Jesus Christ,*

Christ; ver. 91. and well we may, since the sufferance or entrance of Sin is here referred to the gracious purpose of Reconciling, attoning, and saving. Is this the way of vindicating the glory of the Divine Attributes, to make no more but a light jest at Christs honour in this kind? still I say *Wisdom is justified of all her Children, Luk. 7. 34, 39.* this he himself spake when men imputed to him a carnal Dispensation with our actual Sins; and so much may we say when any man will deprive him of that honour is due unto him from his spiritual dispensation in our Originals. Neither let him say to us, *That the honour of our blessed Saviour does no way depend upon our imaginations, and weak Propositions;* we will say so too, and peradventure might say so more justly against him; only we let him know right inferences are no imaginations, neither are strong deductions weak propositions. And if what I have drawn hence be not directly from the Text, let him but be pleased to take the illative along with him, and then infer what he can otherwise, or to the contrary. I confess I would not in any wise have this illation thought redundant,

dundant., for that were to make the *Scripture* either impure and corrupt, or or else idle and superfluous; yet should I not have excepted at all, if any (following my *Siriack* Translation) had omitted it upon this consideration; That it is a hard matter (especially in a comparison betwixt *Adam* and *Christ*) to define a cause, or give a reason for Original Sins entrance into the world, or descent upon posterity. But then this should be observed withall, if such a thing be hardly rendred, it should not be rashly inquired into, because our *inquisitiveness* (in this case) tends more to the dishonour, than all our *Resolution* can to the honour of the *Divine Attributes*.

As by one Man] Whom we may (not amiss) understand in an unity of name, order, person, nature, sex, action, and Type. 1. Of name, *Adam*, which appellation comprehends also both the person, the sex, and the kind. 2. Of Order, *sc.* the first man *Adam*. 1 Cor. 15. 45. and so the very *Hebraism*, or *Græcism* (of the cardinal for the ordinal) would give it if need were. 3. Of Person, *sc.* in the individual, in number singularly and

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. 19

and precisely taken, and so Original Sin properly derived from the prime, and not from the proximate Parents, or according to their pluralities, 4. Of sex, the male and not the female, who though she was first in the transgression, yet some will have him to be solely understood in this propagation. But, for my part, I confesse I can see no cause for such an exception, but that they may be understood one *Flesh*, one in the *Image*, one in the *prævarication*, and so one in the *Propagation*, 5. Of *Nature*, as one not only *in individuo* but *in specie*, one comprehending and representing the whole root and stock and seed and generation, and nature and condition of Mankind, so *Adam* is taken for the whole *species* of Men, and the *Beast* singularly for the whole species of Beasts. 6. Of *Act*, namely, one in the *Dis-obedience* or *Offence*. For it was not the simple or meer nature that was the means of such a derivation, but the offending and disobedient Nature, by which (causally and instrumentally) this privation and depravation, this stain and guilt descended upon all; yea not only the *Offence of one*, but one of
fence:

fence; for it was his first Act that was imputed to us, and none of the rest. 7. Of Type, for *Adam* is here said to be the Figure or Type of *Christ*, under this notion (as one) as much as in any thing else, the whole Comparison throughout.

Sin] No great matter how many and various soever be the acceptions of *Sin* in the *Scriptures*, since in this place it is defined by the Apostle to be *Sin* in the singular, and not said plurally *Sins*, as if he would precisely determine it of that one root of *Sin*, distinct from those many following fruits. Yea, it may be thus readred *the Sin*, very Emphatically, and is understood by almost all (from ancient to modern) for no other but Original *Sin* simply so accepted, as the only *Sin* which came by *one Man* singularly, and entered into all the world universally, whereas actual sins are by many men, neither enter they into all the world in general, but rather into these and those particulars therein; yea it is *Sin* simply, absolutely, properly, formally; For (as himself grants) this *Sin* had its beginning by the disobedience of *Adam*, and disobedience is a transgression of a Law, and that's the very formality of

Sin;

Sin; and that law was the law of the Image, or of perfect Nature. Now see Sir I beseech you! what is here (but in the least shew) whereby to collect this sin to be *Metonymically* so called? or what kind of *Metonymie* would he have it? is it a *Metonymie* of the cause put for the effect? So it seems he would have it, *because it is the effect of one sin*: Surely that *one sin* was a proper and real cause; how strange is it then, That it should beget an effect like to it in nothing, but in a Tropical or Tralatitious, an equivocal and abusive name? if by the cause for the effect be meant Sin put for the Punishment, how contrary is that to *St. Pauls* exprels words. *Sin entred into the world, and death by Sin*, so far is he from confounding them, that in most exprels manner he distinguishes between them, both in name and signification; For should his words be made to signifie thus, *Death*, (that is the punishment) entered by Sin (that is the punishment) *Death* the punishment of the punishment, I beseech you what sense were this? yet we grant (though it is not so to be argued from the word in this place) Original Sin is both a Sin and

a punishment too : A sin, from the humane injustice perverting , a punishment, from the Divine Justice deserting : Or will he have it a *Metonymy* of the Effect put for the Cause ? for so his other words intimate, *because it is the cause of many sins* , and those many sins, (without doubt) he means properly so called ; then seems it so much the more strange, and almost prodigious, that so many real effects should proceed from a poorly equivocal and transnominated cause. *Rhetoricians* observe that such kind of *Metonymies* are usual in external causes and effects only; that an internal cause then should be put for an external effect must needs be most unusual.

Entred into the World.] We may understand this Entrance of Sin in divers senses, and that very *Orthodoxally*. 1. Sin was not in the beginning : for it had no being before the *Entering*, and therefore was no eternal evil principle, but only the issue of some inordinate and irregular Act. 2. *It entered* not as a creature or substance that had some existence in it self, but as a vicious accident that could not subsist without a Subject, in

in which it must inhere: And therefore though it entred into our Nature and substance, yet our nature and Substance it was not, 3. *It entered not of it self, but by means, by one man, by a second cause.* Therefore (himself grants) Sin had its beginning, and thence let the fault and guilt be fetcht causally, what need is there to seek further than the beginning? why then is there such prying into the first cause? such disputing, such labouring to entitle hereunto his Decreeing, his ordaining, and permitting, disposing, dispensing, &c. For so indeed the most we do is but to disparage and dishonour him in his glorious Titles and Attributes: It is enough for us to beleieve him to be just, wise, good, &c. in all things, because he cannot possibly be otherwise, although in some dispensations it is not possible for us to comprehend him. 4. *If entered into, Loe* the *Apostle* speaks plainly of an ingression, not as of an accession of a thing inward, and not outward only, doubtless then it must needs be something *inherent* and not *imputed* only. 5. *It entered into the World* is *used* in it came into, even the reduplicated preposition is a note of more intimate and

and peculiar manner of introduction; namely by way of Generation and Propagation, not by *Temptation*, nor by *Imitation*; not by *Temptation*, for so it came from the Devil to *Eve*; not by *Imitation*, for so it came from *Eve* to *Adam*; but by Propagation, for so it came from *Adam* to us all. Had it been otherwise than so, Sin could not (in any adapteth or propriety) have been said to have *Entered into the world*; but the world must then have caused it, and called it, and sought it, and brought it, and taught it to it self.

And death by Sin [that is to say] by the same Sin which came into the world by one Man, namely the Original: So then death it is, that cannot be denied: But now men must be Judges, and take upon them to determine what kind of death, albeit the *Apostle* speak it never so indefinitely. He must mean temporal death, says he; well and thus he may infer it, because *St. Paul* speaks of such a Death as entered into this world, and that's but temporal: But then he ought to observe withall, that *St. Paul* speaks here, not only of Deaths first Entrance, but of Deaths through passage; now such

such a passage is out of the world, and beyond it, and so must be eternal. But he objects, *eternal death did not pass upon all men.* That's easie to be answered from some of his own words. The Sentence did, though the Execution did not; in the one was the Divine Justice to be magnified, and his Mercy in the other. Thus the Divine Attributes know how to save, and to exalt themselves on either side: if men would not seek to make them seem to clash, by humbling those high things to their low and weak apprehensions.

And so Death passed upon all men] sc.
 Death entred by Sin; and so (by Sin)
 Death passed: So that (whether we
 consider the *terminus a quo*, or *ad quem*)
 we may directly hence collect, that
 Death (even the coporal as well as the
 eternal) was not the sequel or necessity
 of Nature, but even the penalty and wa-
 ges of Sin, because death is a separation
 quite contrary to the natural union, e-
 specially to that of Nature in her inte-
 grity and original perfection. But say
 that (because of a composition, and that
 of contrary Elements) there might be
 nevertheless some kind of *mutation*, me-
 C *gration*

gration, melioration; yet this was far from separation, dissolution, confusion, and that dolorous and ignominious, execrable and damnable. This makes me I cannot so well brook or digest those passages of his. *His Sin left him to his Nature, -- we returned to the state of meer nature -- of our prime creation -- thrust back to the form of Nature -- was remanded to his mortal natural State, --* means he to a corrupt state of Nature? that was not the former, or from the prime Creation; or means he by the form of Nature that of Natures first forming? why that was after the Divine Image and similitude; or means he by meer Nature those they call *Pure Naturals*? which indeed are nothing, because Nature cannot be so abstractly considered, but either in the state of Integrity, or in the state of Corruption, a third state (before, between, or after those two) never was, and therefore is not to be imagined. Ever since the Fall, and Original Sin we aptly conceive that there is a difference still to be made betwixt the substance of Nature, and the corruption of Nature: But that this Nature and this corruption was ever separated in any
 (Chri st

(Christ only excepted) we beleeve not, or that there shall be a State of pure Naturals again till the Resurrection of the Dead. We all know and beleeve *Adam* by his disobedience defected and fell from what he was before, *sc.* from the Image and Original Righteousness; but that by his Sin he fell into a Nature or state which he had before, or without original righteousness, that we understand not, not yet of any remanding; obtruding or returning thither. Indeed we read, God said, *Dust thou art, and so Dust thou shalt return*, Gen. 3. 19. but that noted only some materials in part, but no certain state, neither had that dust returned to the dust, but that the Image and righteousness was forfeited and lost. For we see it was so not by a natural propensity, so much as by a provoked Commination. Besides this, methinks he says something to oppose himself in this part, when he says, *our Nature is of Gods making, and consequently is good*, -- or *Nature is almost the same*, &c. -- What good? and yet punished? nay and we remanded to it for a punishment? What almost the same in goodness? and yet nothing the same in immortality and the blessing? Thus here

again Gods Justice is brought upon the Stage; nay and upon the rack too, especially by our scanning betwixt the two Terms of *Death entring by one man*, and *Death passing upon all men*.-- For we cry, why the punishment, and how, of all, for one, & so forth? Mean while it is not considered by us (Nay not believed) how we were all in the lump & loyns of that one, which remains hereafter to be demonstrated, only thus much is now to be said, That while the Divine Attributes are pretended for, saved harmless by us, either we our selves doe it, or else give occasion for others to quarrel at them.

For that all have sinned] This clause thus translated was greedily snatch'd at of old, to extenuate and excuse the severity of Deaths universal passing; and not only so, but to alter and divert the cause and guilt, from the Original Sin to the Actual. For this cause the Antients did either reject this Translation, or did not so wel accept it: But I am to speak of this our Paraphrast, whose words (by reason of this Translation) are imposing on the Apostle, *if he means eternal Death*, he must not mean that it came for *Adams sin*, but in as much as *all men have sinned*, that is, upon all those upon whom

eternal death did come, *it came because they also have sinned*; and again in passing on us, *For that all have sinned, that is, the sin was reckoned to all, not to make them guilty like Adam, but Adams Sin pas'd upon all imprinting this real calamity on us all; but yet death descended also upon Adams posterity for their own Sins, for since all did Sin all should die.* His (also) once and again seems to admit of original sin for her share in this reckoning; but his (*inasmuch*) quite thrusts it out, & brings in actual sin in its stead; Actual sin I say is obtruded and Original sin excluded; at least for propriety, for guilt, for imputation, for likeness, for equality: Yet I shall not therefore reject this Translation, because I see our Church hath accepted it, and shall hope to make it stand good in this sense, *For that all have sinned, that is, sinned Originally although not Actually, sinned naturally in Adams Sin, although as yet not personally, or in their own, and am confident he is not ignorant I can find Abettors for this exposition amongst the reformed and Orthodox Expositors far before him*: But, Sir, if you will be pleased to look upon the Margin (which I suppose he winked at)

know it is pointed at by our Church as a note of equal indifferency and authority, and there you find in *whom all have sinned*, this speaks plainly of sinning not actually in our selves, but originally in *Adam*; and this Translation is every whit as much, and rather more congruous to the *Original Text*; for my part I rather embrace this latter Translation, with most Translators or Interpreters old or late. And with them conceive it to be the safer, as not giving such way to the Errors of the *Pelagians* old or new: Nay I hold it to be the sounder, and more consonant to the very Letter; for why should (*ὁ* & *ὅς*) be translated so flatly in the Neuter Gender, when 'tis found so Emphatically in the Masculine being it may with so close and so apt Concord be referred to the *One Man* spoken of before; for construe it in the Masculine, and the Relative fairly agrees with the proximate and eminent Antecedent; but take it in the Neuter, and then the Relative is without any Antecedent at all, or else must be turned into some obscurer and less significant part of speech. *Erasmus* (who labours like a Critick to draw it this other way) would not

not allow of St. *Augustines* referring it to Sin; because of the different gender, though he confesses it to be the same in sense to say, in which Man, or in which Sin. As for *Erasmus*, (whom all have occasion to honour, from the Cradle to the Crown of learning) him this Author recommends to us more precisely to be reckoned amongst the greatest and the best *Expositors of Scripture* that any age since the *Apostles*, and their immediate *Successors* hath brought forth; (as for the learned *Groius*, whom he reckons with him, I only say thus much; As he was a most eminent Adversary to the *Socinian*, so he was sometimes a not approved Advocate of the *Arminian*, both which are reprov'd for their opinions about Original sin) But on Gods name let him add all he can to *Erasmus*, yet I would not have him detract any thing from St. *Augustin* (which thing was sometime charged upon *Erasmus* himself) both are to be mentioned with honour as the *Worthies* of their Ages. And therefore all he hath said (had it been more) should have past for me without exception, had he spoken it at another time, and upon another place: For up-

on this place (he cannot but know)
 That *Erasmus* hath not only been
 suspected but taxed (even by learned
 men of his own time and religion) for
 more than I now think fit to express :
 only as to the clause, nay and whole
 verse in hand *Erasmus* is much contend-
 ing for a Tropologie (and peradventure
 hence it was that he hinted his *Metonymie*) But for all his Rhetorick he turns
 Grammarian, and plaies the Critick be-
 twixt, *ἐν* *ἐ* and *ἐν* *ἐ* and will hardly be
 perswaded of *ἐν* for *ἐν* in the Dative
 Case, yet at length acknowledges, *Be-
 cause the use of Greek Prepositions are so
 various, I dare not affirm that ἐν is no
 where joyned with a Dative Case, where
 one thing is declared to be in another, like
 as the Tree is in the seed.* A most apt si-
 militude to illustrate our being in *Adam*,
 and our sinning in him too. Were it not
 for this his confession, places of such
 construction were easie to be prodused,
 but I spare them, as likewise his *propter
 unum*, his *pervasit*, his *quatenus peccavimus*,
 which also might be of a facile con-
 nivence, were it not in case of dangerous
 consequence and contention; besides my
 task is to pursue, not his but this Authors
 paraphrase.

Verse

Verse 13. *For until the Law Sin was in the world, but sin is not imputed where there is no Law.*

F*Or until the Law Sin was in the world* That is, from the beginning, of the world, all that time which went before, until that very period wherein the Law was externally promulgated: Sin was nevertheless (even all that while) in the world: For the *Apostle* so speaks now, with intent to occur to a certain objection, (an Objection not so much of mens *Mervail* or *Scruple*, but rather of their *Peisulancy* and *Cavillation*) an objection that indeed hath been always but too much inculcated by the *Adversaries* of Original Sin: Thus, Where there is no *Law*, there is no transgression: But there is no Law given against Original Sin. *Ergo*, This is it which the *Apostle* here prevents, by saying, Sin was in the world during all that space of time which went before the giving or promulgating of the Law of *Moses*, notwithstanding it was not a Sin without a Law, but so it was, by vertue of the Law of Na-

ture; the rule of original righteousness, the dictates of right reason, the eternal moral Law; the Law written in *Mens hearts*, before it was written in *Tables of Stone*: For Original sin was not so much forbidden, convinced, condemned by the promulgated Law that followed it, and was directed chiefly to persons and actions: as by the internal law of the Image which went before it, with a perpetual obligation of integrity to the whole Nature; of such a Law speaks the Apostle in this Epistle, *When the Gentiles which have not the Law do by Nature the things contained in the Law, these having not the Law, are a Law unto themselves, which shew the work of the Law written in their hearts, their conscience also bearing witness, and their thoughts the meanwhile accusing or else excusing one another.* Rom. 2. 14, 15. And this certainly was Law sufficient both to convince men of this Sin, and condemn them for it. Say the Law of Nature be greatly obscured, and the conscience thereupon blinded; yet for all that it is usually making this argument, upon any peccancy: *Something now is which ought not to be, and there-*

therefore by consequence, something is not which ought to be, and thus by the exorbitances grows conscious of the defects, and this Collection is enough for conviction of the want of natural goodness, and that is a divine apprehension of the loss of original righteousness, wherefore then speaks he thus? *Nature alone gives rules, but does not bind to penalties*;—if by Nature alone he means fallen, corrupted nature, now in her defections, she gives neither rules, nor binds to penalties; but only lies bound both to rules and to penalties. But to speak of Nature in her integrity and perfection, she doth them both directly, for she were not perfect without a rule, neither were her rule perfect without a penalty upon the violation of it; his other words (in my judgement) as they are little to the Apostles meaning, so they are lesse to common Truth, *Death* (he says) *did presently descend upon all Mankind even before a Law was given them, with an appendant penalty, viz. with the exprest intermination of death*; was not that Law exprest enough? *In that day that thou eatest thereof thou shalt surely die.* Gen. 2. 17. I need not ask him whether this Law

Law did concern the man alone? for he confesses it did presently descend upon all Mankind; But what? death without a Law? and a Law without a penalty? He that contended so before to vindicate Gods attributes in regard of a *Sentence* without *Execution*, how will he extricate himself from impinging thereupon, in talking thus of an *Execution* without a *Sentence*? certainly the Divine Attributes are much more out of question, in pronouncing utterly upon all, and yet sparing some, than in executing upon all (although but in the least degree) having not yet denounced against any. As for his next words, let him look well to what he saies, it is impossible they should passe even moderate men without a censure, or some scanning at the least; *with him*, (that is *with Adam*) *God being angry* (was he provoked against the person only, and not against the whole Nature) *was pleased to curse* (was not that pleasure in a manner absolute, that had no more but an improper respect to curse all for the Sin of one?) *To curse him also in his posterity* (nay was it not rather to curse his posterity in him? for he but little

felt

felt his curse in them, but they were long to feel their curse in him?) and leave them also in their meer natural condition (was this natural condition any kind of state before the Fall? then could it not be curst or miserable; was it that after the Fall? then was it not meer or pure natural, but altogether depraved and corrupted) But God was pleased to leave them: (So then Gods great and easily justifiable action, was the good pleasure of his desertion, wisely, justly to leave them destitute of the forfeited Image, and to let them alone to themselves in that corrupt condition to which they betrayed:) But he says more, *To wish yet they disposed themselves.* To what? to their meer natural condition, to which God curst them, in which he left them. But how disposed themselves hereunto? I hope he will not say 'twas any personal disposition of ours, for that goes far beyond all that hath been said of our natural inclination; but if he intend it only of our actual and following sins, they did not dispose us to our fallen estate, and corrupt natural condition; but only confirm us in it; what can be spoken more against Order
— than

than that following actions should dispose to a foregoing condition? we use to say, the first person corrupted our Nature; but in all else it is the nature that corrupts the persons; personal sins are no whit disposing to the Nature, but aggravating to the person only: *Original Sin*, though it doe not act alike in all, yet it is but one and alike in all, be the personal actions more or less. He concludes, yet for the anger which God had against Mankind he left that Death which he threatened to Adam expressly by implication to fall upon his posterity. Now I demand but this, Was the anger of God with Adam, and against Mankind, the same? well then it had the same provocation: Nay, but he will have this last to be upon our own evil *Commissions* and *deserts*; Then I must demand again why was that Death the same? is it righteous that shou'd be the same penalty, and not the same provocation? But he left it to fall by *Implication*, that's an implicated word, and may imply Error, as well as truth: If he implies our *Original* defection, that's a truth; but if our actual *Commissions* only, that's the Error: But I will take (by implication) as he here contradistinguishes it to

Expressively threatened, and so it draws near, nay comes home to the truth of my Text: That before *Moses Law* sin was in the world, even Original Sin, and the Sin of the first Parent, and that by a Law of its own, which Law though it was *Expressively threatened* but to Adam only, yet by *implication* (of Sin and corruption in the whole nature) the punishment (through that implying Law) justly fell upon the whole posterity.

But Sin is not imputed where there is no Law.] In these words St. Pauls intention is not so much to prove the being of Sin, from the being of a Law; but rather the being of a Law, from the being of a Sin: And therefore he thus argues, Sin was in the world before the promulgation of *Moses Law*: but that could not be unless there was a Law to convince it so to be. *Ergo* A law there was. And again Sin is not imputed when there is no Law; but it was imputed. *Ergo* there was a Law. And this is the more certain and infallible way of arguing, because the being of a Law does not necessarily, and always argue the being of a Sin, but the being of a Sin does necessarily and always argue the being of

a Law ; For a Law may be a Law, though no sin be yet committed ; but a Sin is no Sin till the Law be imposed ; now the Law was always , as being the eternal Law, and eternally existing in the divine mind , yea, and more or less imprinted in the minds and consciences of Men from the beginning. The Law therefore being before the Sin , there was no time of the world after Sin, wherein Sin was not imputed. But much ado is here made by the means of distinguishing or diversifying Questions, viz. whether this imputing of Sin be by God, or by men? whether it be of Original Sin, or of actual? whether it be by the eternal and natural, or by the written and published Law ; whether it be of the fault and corruption, or of the guilt and punishment, whether it be to penalty temporal or eternal? whether this imputation be of our own sins or another's? Whether this imputation be distinguished or divided from inherence? Thus we trouble our selves and one another, and the Truth betwixt us with many a Fallacy of Division; whereas much error were to be avoided by taking both together in a conjoynd sense, and the

the Truth were easily determined in all those questions, or in most part of any of the questions; by accepting both parts indifferently, even the one as well as the other: As to speak only to this Authors words or divided Propositions: *The Apostle (he saith) speaketh here of Sin imputed; therefore not of Sin inherent.* Not so by his leave, for the Apostle speaks not here of any distinction at all, betwixt imputed and inherent sin; but of Sin indefinitely and universally, and that imputed only by a Law; now the Law properly imputes Sin, be it never so properly inherent, as in actual sins, though they be inherent; yet the Law properly does but impute them; So in Original Sin, the Law does impute it, yet so as it is inherent. So that in one or other the Sin is nevertheless inherent for being imputed; nor imputed for being inherent: *And if imputed to such purposes as he here speaks of, viz. to Temporal Death: then it is neither a Sin properly, nor yet imputable to eternal; so far as is or can be implied by the Apostles words.* Yes, yes, the contrary to all this in every purpose is not only implied, but apparent from the *Apostles words.*

For

For the *Apostle* speaks of Death indefinitely (without any limitation to these or those purposes) and that's an universal implying all kinds of Death : Besides Death here by *Adam* must so be taken as proportionably extending to the life by Christ ; otherwise wrong is done to the whole comparison, and consequently to all our *Saviours Attributes* ; Now the life we are here said to gain by the Excellency of Christ , is not only a corporal life, opposite to a temporal death, but a justification of life , opposite to a spiritual Death , and a reigning in life , opposite to an eternal Death : *Whensoever another mans sin is imputed to his relative, therefore, because it is anothers, and imputed, it can goe no further, but to effect certain evils to afflict the relative, but to punish the cause, not formally to denominate the descendant or relative to be a Sinner* ; So he saith again, to which thus much is to be said ; That what perhaps may be congruously spoken betwixt one particular man and another, is very inconsutile to be said betwixt *Adam* and all Mankind. Betwixt Man and Man , we know the Descendants of Traitors and Vassals, in relation to their progenitors

niters offences, are punish'd, though they were not formally the Offenders: And therefore such words may say something, in respect of proximate Parents, and of relatives yet living, upon whom their condition may reflect, and to whom their example may be usefull; but in relation betwixt the prime Parent and us his descendants, they say nothing at all; For he was not punished for our Sins, but we for his; neither was he punished in our punishment, but we in his; neither was his simply another mans sin, but ours also; neither was it imputed only, but inherent also; neither were we *Relatives* only, but *accessories* only; neither were we *Descendants* only, but participants (all this is to be understood of the Common nature, union, and *representation*) and therefore here was enough to denominate us formally to be Sinners. But I cannot but wonder at such a restrictive largeness in the saying, *Another mans sin imputed, therefore because it is anothers and imputed.* For the Sin or the crime to be imputed, therefore because it is imputed, and for the evil or punishment to be inflicted for another mans Sin

sin therefore, because it is anothers; this is horrid to think of even in Men, what is it then to urge in such a case as this, where it cannot but reflect even upon God himself? But (about this imputation) he yet urges, *Nor Reason, nor Scriptures, nor Religion does enforce, and no Divine attribute does permit that we should say that God did so impute Adams sin to his posterity, that he did really esteem them to be guilty of Adams sin, equally culpable, equally hatefull: though this latter part be said but by few; yet this Scripture in hand enforces us to say, That God did really esteem them to be guilty of Adams Sin [in whom all have sinned] that is, really sinned, and by whose disobedience they were made Sinners, sc. really so made; if he did so only impute, as not really and verily esteem guilty; what kind of imputation (I pray) was that? imaginative, opinionative, suspicious, pretensive, presumptive, conjectural, phantastical, equivocal, abusive, or, (as are his own words) figurative, Metonymical, collateral, indirect? this we are sure no Reason, no Scripture, no Religion, no Divine Attribute will permit to say so; But because*

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. 45

cause he wil have us say *equally culpable, equally hatefull, &c.* we will say it in the most convenient sense, we may be equally culpable in our common nature, equally hatefull in our Natural Sin, the *same Malice* of our Nature, the *same action* of our Nature, *as much guilty as he*, according to that universal nature wherein he comprised and represented us all; and so much, he is not unknowing all Religions (primitive and latter, Protestant and Papists) have said, not without reason and Scripture, nor is any Attribute of God to be objected there against. But to suppose *that we have sinned* (take us truly as in our Nature, union, mass, root, stock, &c.) *lesse than he*, or *That God imputed this Sin lesse to us than to him*; this (say we) is but supposition, and that is far from probation; and therefore we would faine learn that *Analogie of Faith*, those *Words of Scripture*, that *proportion*, and *Notice of the Divine Attributes*, that would inforce us to suppose so much. But I return to the *Apostles supposition*, who here supposes that there was no time of the world since the *First mans fall*, wherein there was not a Law, and Sin,

sin and the imputation: How is it then
 that he says of Mankind? *They did do
 actions unnatural and vile enough, but
 yet these sins were not yet so imputed—*
 were they indeed unnatural and vile,
 and yet not so imputed? upon what
 ground then does he censure them for
 such? that cannot be but a calumnious
 aspersions, that pre-occupates the Law,
 and precedes the Divine Imputation;
 let him say how were they unnatural?
 but because done against the Law of
 Nature; and why vile enough? but
 because that pure and perfect law was
 sufficient so to convince them: Original
 Sin could never have been called so,
 but that there was a Law of Original
 righteousness, that went before it; how
 then can actual sins be said to foregoe a
 Law? *For they did do actions, personal,
 actual Sins, even these done, and yet not
 imputed?* Oh, what an imputation were
 this to the eternal Law, the Law of Na-
 ture, of right reason, and true Consci-
 ence? But will this salve it to say, they
 were not yet so imputed? that will not do
 it; if he so means that nothing was impu-
 ted from the first upon their Original
 account, to the eternal and internal; but
 after-

afterwards, upon the external publication of the Law of Moses, these things were imputed to them upon their personal account; nor will that do it, if he pretends these things were not imputed even unto death: For it is out of question, that *Moses Law* (as to the morality of it) added no new vertue, goodness, truth, obligation, imputation or penalty, which was not in force before from the eternal and internal Law of God and Nature, of which *Moses Law* was no more but the *External publication*; but to speak of actual Sins being in Men, and yet not imputed by God, and of Original Sin deputed to deadly punishment, and yet not imputed by a Law, I say, to speak to such purposes, is such an imputation to the Divine Attributes, as I need not now to say.

For

Verse 14. Nevertheless death reigned from Adam to Moses even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, who is the figure of him that is to come.

Nevertheless Death reigned from Adam to Moses] But for all that the Law of Moses was not yet given or promulgated to a peculiar people; Death notwithstanding reigned throughout the whole world: For all that time (comprehensively and inclusively) from Adam his Fall, his deprivation of the Image, and depravation of Nature; Till Moses his publication of the Law written in Tables of stone; and so during that whole *Oeconomie* or dispensation, even until Christ and the Gospel of his Grace; by whom alone all that believe are justified from all things (both Sin and Death) from which they could not be justified by the Law of Moses. And therefore till then (terminally and exclusively) Death reigned, and Sin likewise; because the dominion and tyranny of these two always goe together; Now

Now after the duration, the main thing remarkable is the domination or *Deaths reigning*, which cannot exactly be, but as she is understood in her whole law and power, and in their full latitude or extent: *sc.* in the forcible denunciation, and infliction of Death *temporal, spiritual, and eternal*; For where she is so restrained as to go no farther than the corporal only, so far is she then from anything like to reigning, that she is now, as it were, swallowed up in Victory; but take her in her utmost Tyranny, and she reigned from *Adam to Moses*, that is, for Original, as well as for actual sin: For consider her subjects, and her power and authority was,

Even over them that had not sinned after the similitude of Adams transgression, That is over Infants, whose reason and discretion, will, and affections, had not yet made them ripe enough for action and imitation; and therefore they had not sinned actually, or in their own persons, but Originally, or in their first Parents *loving, Adams similitude, likeness, or Image*, in which he begat his Posterity (*Gen. 5. 3.*) was that of Original sin, because it was contradistinct to that

D

image

image, likeness, or similitude in which God had made him, (*Gen. 1, 26, 27.*) which was that of *Original Righteousness*. And to Sin after the similitude of *Adams* transgression, is, to imitate him, follow him, make him our example, and our selves altogether like him; and therefore not to have sinned after that similitude, is, not to have done so. Now then to construe it (with this Author) of *sinning not so grievously, or of sinning lesse* than he did, is to make it come little near to, nay, make it fall very much short of sinning after the similitude of his Transgression, or according to the proportion of his prevarication; To sin less, is, not to sin according to the equality: But a man may sin less by much, and yet sin after the similitude nevertheless: He that ere this started this very notion (*non peccaverunt ad illius similitudinem; hoc est non tam capitaliter -- non perinde graviter peccaverunt atque ille*) applies it rather (as others besides him do) to the *Gentiles* than to the *Patriarchs*, (and indeed in such a construction, the *Gentiles* should sin lesse than the *Patriarchs*, as not having the Law, or the like means they had) But if the same Man had

had been taken up, or followed in his other suggestion (*regnabit mors in similitudine*) the reigning of Death had so been made as vain a semblance, and as light a shadow, as some would make that of Original Sin. But they who suggest that this sinning after the similitude, is neither to be understood of sinning after an internal principle; nor yet after an external example; but only upon and after the direct expression, and express direction of a precept; These (ere they are aware) do take from the Actual and add to the Original; while they thus exempt all before the written law, as likewise all *Heathens*, to this day, from sinning after *Adams* similitude, or rather doe thus deny to most men Sin both Original and Actual; but though we may make *Adams* a Sin similitude to our selves in matters past; yet it hath pleased God to propose him, as a comfortable *type* for the future.

Who is the figure of him that was to come] Behold! here's a typical promise, sufficient to satisfy all querulous complaining, and to prevent all quarrellous charging God foolishly, in calling any of his Articles to question in the case,

Since *Adam*, who received Gods similitude, not for himself alone, but for all his posterity after him, had now forfeited the same both for himself and them all, and had now begotten them in his own similitude of prevarication and defection; and in that very similitude they were now found, and so left; left (and that justly) to the Tyranny of Sin and Death, yea even those, who had not as yet (according to all actual circumstances) sinned after the similitude of *Adams* transgression; Neverthelſſe they were yet in the estate of Natural corruption, and by that Nature, worthily born Children of wrath; but what if they had already sinned after that similitude, and had now made him their Example to sin, and to die by? yet hath God (of his good pleasure) made him the Type or figure of Christ, intimating that they who are elected by him, and beleeve in him, shall not die by the *one*, in whom they sinned; but shall live by the *other*, in whom they beleeved; For as the first man *Adam*, was the head and principle of Nature to us, and after that of Sin, so is this second *Man Adam* (*Christ the Lord*) the principle and head

head of Grace to us; and after that of
Glory. Behold then (each one) the
goodness and severity of God; On them
which fell *severity*; But towards thee
goodness if thou continue in his good-
ness: And thus indeed are the Divine
Attributes to be magnified by us on
either part.

D 3

Verse

Verse 15. *But not as the offence so also is the free gift: for if through the offence of one many be dead, much more the grace of God, and the gift by grace, which is by one Man Jesus Christ, hath abounded unto many.*

But not as the offence so also is the free gift] The Comparison is now not interrupted, but pursued with a correction; For he confesses that in the Analogy there lies a great deal of disparity. There may be a Συμμετρία, or some resemblance between the persons; as each of them being the First, the Author, the Head, the Root, the Foundation, the Representative of his kind but there is a Διακρίσις, an utter difference of the things: as betwixt Sin and Grace, Death and Life: And therefore though there may be comparing of the persons, with an infinite preferring on the one part; yet there can be no conferring of the things, but with an utter differing, both for account, and effect; because there may be some Typical proportion betwixt Adam

dam and Christ, with the due honour reserved to the *Great Reconciler*; but betwixt the offence of one, and the *Free gift* of the other, remains an utter disproportion, never to be reconciled: For the one both is from, and is the Image of the *Earthly*, the other is from, and is the Image of the *Heavenly*; the one is naturally transmitted, the other supernaturally conferred; the one from Free-will, the other from Free grace; the one tending to Death, but the other to everlasting life.

For if through the offence of one many be dead, &c.] In this part of the collation, this is one main instance of prelation from the disparity of power and effect, as if he had thus said, suppose the worst that followed Original Sin, that innace offence; yet forasmuch as the remedy propounded so far exceeded the propagated malady, what cause is here to complain or challenge any of the *Divine Attributes*? since wisdom herein manifests and magnifies her self so excellently, so exceedingly, (both for substance and measure) why should not her children herein seek to justify her herein above all? what if it was through the

essence of one, ought that to offend? were we not one Nature, one *Species* of Men, both he and we? In the participation of that *Species*, all men were to be reckoned as one Man, the sundry persons of men being to that one Man, but as the several Members are to the same body: Moreover this may be enough to satisfy all minds, and stop all mouths; *The Grace of God, and the gift of Grace*, (both his liberal favour, and our competent measure) is also by one *Man Jesus Christ*: And why then should we set our selves to wrangle so, with God, with our selves, and one another, because of the Justice and Severity which descends to us but duly from *the one* in one way; and not rather rest our selves contented, and greatly rejoyce, for the *Grace and Mercy* that most freely and superabundantly proceeds towards us from *that one man Jesus Christ* another way? Oh! what peevish things we are! to vex our selves in thinking, how we were made subject to the punishment on the one hand; when we might sweetly satisfy our selves, in beleeving how we are made capable of the exceeding recompence of reward on the other. And
grant

grant again by the *first one*, and through his one way *many be dead*, understand it withall emphatically spoken *οἱ πολλοί*; *the many*, that is *All*; for it is not *many* comparatively, but absolutely; not so spoken as to except some, but to intimate *All*; *All* (I say) collectively, and inclusively, and not so sparingly or seemingly (as he speaks) *even as it were all*, *Enoch also* (contrary to his mind) *not excepted*: how much less *those few more*, of whom peradventure mention is not made? The first is a fond conceit, but the next a vainer crotchet: For take *Many* (as he would) in the restrained way, and *Dead*, but for corporally so; yet even *Enoch* was among that *many*, & so is dead; For it is not his peculiar and abstruse way of dying that can hinder to say truly *he is dead*; For *Heb. 11. 7.* though he was translated by an extraordinary power, *that he should not see Death*, after the common way; yet for the verity and reality of Death, it was said of him together with the rest, *These all died*, *vers. 13.* But taking it (according to the *Apostle*) in the largest sense, I must say more, *All are dead*, namely, though not effectually, yet virtually;

though not naturally, yet deservedly; according to a just sentence, though not according to the fearfull Execution; But notwithstanding all this, and all that can be said of the offences worst, and Death's utmost; how would it appease our consciences, and comfort our spirits (even in all wherein the Divine Majesty has been pleased to reveal, either himself, or our selves to us) to conceive rightly, and heartily consider *the grace of God*, which is to be understood his good will and pleasure, free goodnesse, everlasting love, exceeding favour, with all his *beloved Sons* merits, and *Holy Spirits* efficacies, and *the gift by Grace*, sc. our measures of Sanctification, with the duties required, the comforts promised, and the benefits received? And all this by *One man Jesus Christ*, sc. by his life and actions; by his death and passion; by his merits and mediation alone. To whom we had no natural, or necessary relation (as we had unto the other) but as he was made Man, and so freely and gratically gave himself to us, and for us. And thus the grace of God hath much more abounded in pardoning all kinds and measures of

of

of sin, and in preventing the same, as concerning punishment: But the *Free gift* hath abounded also, we being made both more holy and more happy in *Christ* than in *Adam*, we were made corrupt, and miserable, yea and this abounded unto *Many*, that is *All* again, and that in sufficiency, though not in effect, else the excess here spoken of should fall short; inasmuch as Sin and Death passed upon *All*.

Verse 16. *And not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift; for the judgement was by one to condemnation, but the Free gift is of many offences unto justification.*

AND not as it was by one that sinned, so is the gift] It is partly a repetition of the first words in the former verse; only there was the Disparity and excess betwixt the Sin and the Grace; here betwixt the Gift, and the person sinning: There it was said to be more plentifully abounding, here more powerfully effecting; There by what Authors, here to what Ends; There the Free gift was opposed to the Sin, but here to the Judgement.

For the Judgement was by one to condemnation] By the Judgement we understand not only the Decree on God's part, but also the desert on our own; In as much as the word in Scripture notes both the Act and the power of Judgement, as likewise the cause and thing judged: And if we did but truly consider this, then durst we not be so bold

bold in questioning the Divine Attributes, in regard we are taught to apprehend it as a thing not only of his severity, but of our own impiety also: So by *Condemnation* we understand both the *Sentence* and *Execution*; the *threatning* against, as well as the *inflicting* on; likewise we take the ($\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\varsigma\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$) in the Neuter; as wee doe the ($\sigma\iota\ \epsilon\tilde{\nu}\varsigma$) in the Masculine; yea and from the diverse preposition, we note some distinction, namely of the matter and subject, as well as of the cause and instrument: and thereupon we doe not confound them (as he doth) by *One Man sinning one sin*; but somewhat more distinctly, by *one sinning*, or *that sinned*, we understand the Act with relation to *Adams* person; but by the *one sin* we understand the thing it self with relation to our whole Nature, even Original sin it self, to note that *one sin* (original sin) in us, is under the same judgement unto condemnation, as was that *one sinning* in *Adam*; and that in the very Act of his sinning, *we sinned* (as he seems to grant) *very much*: And moreover to that, sinned (which he grants not) as bad as he, & that not only *because of the likeness*

likeness of Nature, and of sin (as he says) but because of the very identity and sameness thereof, in the main substance, though not according to every circumstance; For we *Descendents from Adam*, were perfectly like him in nature, his own real, natural production, and so we sinned, as himself says well; and now if he himself thinks there is so great a *parity of reason* that the evil (he means this judgement unto condemnation) should descend upon us; then in all reason he ought to yeeld not only a likeness, but also a parity of Sin. Yet whereas he says, *the evil was threatned to Adam, and not to his Children*: Then was it not judgement unto condemnation, for judgement implies the Sentence and Commination, as Condemnation does the Execution, or effect. But what? not threatned, and yet descending? will the Lord strike before he warns? I say no more, but (for Gods sake) what kind of Vindication call you that? to urge the evil or punishment so oft, and admit so little of the fault or sin, is (I think verily) the wrong way to a Vindication of the *Divine Attributes*.

But the Free gift is, of many offences
unto

unto justification.] To prevent all our murmuring and censuring, that judgement should be to condemnation by one man or person, the Apostle bids us construe him rightly, and says he means it by one *Sin* or *offence*; for we shall never think Gods ways equal in this case, till we can look upon it with a right Eye; not only as the Sin of one man, and so the Sin of another; But as one sin of all men, and so our own: But the Sin of one, and one Sin, if this satisfy not; yet this makes amends for all abundantly; that the *Free gift is of many offences unto justification*. For mark how it answers to every opposite; the *Free gift* to the *offence*, *many* to *one*, and *justification* to *condemnation*. The first shews how benignly, the next, how bountifully, the last how beneficially the recompense is vouchsafed; as it is the Free gift to the offence; so it signifies Grace in us not to be natural, as the sin is. As it is *many* to *one*; so it betokens a liberal condonation of many actuals, as well as that one Original. As it is *Justification* against *condemnation*; so it signifies a making holy as well as happy, against both the sin and the punishment. Since then

then what God in *Christ* hath here done, is to justifie; let God in *Christ* be justified by all, and in all.

V. rse 14. For if by one mans offence Death reigned by one, much more they who receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of Righteousnesse, shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ.

FOr if by one Man's offence Death reigned by one] It is of no small note, that a mutual construction is here to be made of *one Mans offence*, and *one offence*: The diverse reading shews a coincidence; and however the repetition seems as the note upon their narrow conjunction; nothing has done more prejudice to the truth of this point, and to the Divine Attributes, as they are therein concerned, than a dividing, separating, or over-severe and too nice distinguishing between the *one man*, and the *one offence*; For though the natural corruption may be distinguished from the personal Act, according to some circumstances

stances, yet in substance they are to be considered as one, and the same, because it was (for the main substance) the same sin that *Adam* committed, that entred into the world by him; and well might the same sin passe from the whole, or head, into all the parts, & members; though not in the particular Act, yet in the universal guilt; so that in his very sin we might (not amiss) be said to sin originally, although not actually. The *Apostle* more than once expressly intimates it to be translated indifferently, either the Sin, and offence of one man, or one sin and offence. We should do well therefore to accept it so equally, as he hath been pleased to expresse it: But we look askew upon it, in the personal Act only; as that *one mans* sin, and no more: and so we ascribe and impute all to him most presumptuously; and seek in like manner to shake it off from our selves. Strange it is! we dare not deny that God imputes it to us; and yet we dare be bold to impute it solely to him: For so the *Paraphrast* seems to do: *The Sin of Adam alone*, whereas (in truth) we ought humbly to conceive, and consider it as *one Sin*, both in him, and us; *one Sin*

Sin in our Nature, *one Sin* in our kind ; and so coming to be but one Sin even in the persons of us all. They that goe the first way , are quite out of the way to vindicate the Divine Attributes ; For how is it possible to make it anothers sin alone, and not our own in any proper respect , and yet not give occasion to murmurers and repiners at the imputation, to any purpose whatsoever. Whereas if instead of imposing it altogether upon another , we would be convinc'd and content to take what is our own, unto our selves , That heavy yolk which is upon the Sons of *Adam*, from the day that they goe out of their Mothers womb , till the day that they return to the Mother of all things , would not be so grievous , or so unequal to their apprehensions ; But they would soon be convinc'd to lay their hands upon their mouths ; yea would be content to say every man for himself, This is my Yolk (the image of the earthy) and I will bear it ; I will bear the indignation of the Lord , *because I have sinned against him* ; which is never to be brought to passe if we once go about to unyolk our selves of the Sin : But whether we will do

do so or no, God will be true when all men are found Lyers; his ways will be proved equal, when our ways are reproved for unequal; and wisdom will be justified and cleared, when she is judged, though no flesh living can be justified in her sight. The very punishment and infliction from God, is sufficient to argue the sin and guilt in us: *For Death reigned by one, not only by one man, in the Masculine (as he spake immediately before) but by one in the N.uter, one Sin; for death could never so have reigned by the one Man, had it not been by the one sin: Yet see how he would labour to bring the Original punishment on our heads, that will not admit us to bring the Original Sin so much as upon our Shoulders: For so he supposes it: If the sin of Adam alone could bring death upon the world, who by imitation of his transgression, on the flock of their own natural choice did sin, against God, though not after the similitude of Adams transgression.* How says he? no Sin but in imitation? no punishment but for imitation? he knows full well whose exploded heresie that was, and therefore shall do very well to renounce both
name

name and thing at once. But how agree his own words to themselves? *sinning by imitation, and yet not after the similitude of Adams transgression?* (which cannot genuinely, no nor conveniently be interpreted but of sinning actually, and by imitation; yea let it be understood of sinning less than he did, yet so it is by imitation.) Again, *Sinning on the stock of their own natural choice*, and yet, *not sinning after the similitude of Adams transgression?* Why how sinned Adam but out of the stock of his own natural choice? And how sinned we in him, but out of the stock of his natural choice? for indeed he was our natural stock, and we were the branches thereof: And it was he that received the whole stock of Natures choice, liberty, Free will, and consent for himself, and likewise for us all; and out of this stock of natural choice and liberty it was, that we sinned not only by him, but in him, and with him; wherefore I heartily wish him to be wary how he exempts *sinning after the similitude of Adams transgression*, and sinning on the stock of our own natural choice, each from other, lest he impair that stock, and overthrow that Rock

Rock of liberty, and Free will, which (against both *Supralapsarians*, and *Sublapsarians*) he laboured ere while so earnestly to establish, and so prove to strike upon them, and himself, and the *Divine Attributes*, all at once. But (to remedy all this) here it is not only by *one Man*, who had his personal choice, but by *one sin*, wherein was our natural choice; and therefore let us go on to see what the *Apostle* inferrs, and prefers in such a case.

--- *How much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ*] (c. Though Death reigned much both by one man, and by one sin; yet by one Christ they shall reign much more. But then they must be due-ly qualified, for it is *They which re-ceive*, and that argues no capacity, no ability in them, notwithstanding the blemish of Original sin, for thereby they were under Death's reign, which was spiritual and not corporal only; and held under the power, and utter slavery of Sin as well as Death; rather it convinces them of their privation and impotence, as not having but as they re-ceive;

name and thing at once. But how agree his own words to themselves? *sinning by imitation, and yet not after the similitude of Adams transgression?* (which cannot genuinely, no nor conveniently be interpreted but of sinning actually, and by imitation; yea let it be understood of sinning less than he did, yet so it is by imitation.) Again, *Sinning on the stock of their own natural choice*, and yet, *not sinning after the similitude of Adams transgression?* Why how sinned Adam but out of the stock of his own natural choice? And how sinned we in him, but out of the stock of his natural choice? for indeed he was our natural stock, and we were the branches thereof: And it was he that received the whole stock of Natures choice, liberty, Free will, and consent for himself, and likewise for us all; and out of this stock of natural choice and liberty it was, that we sinned not only by him, but in him, and with him; wherefore I heartily wish him to be wary how he exempts *sinning after the similitude of Adams transgression*, and sinning on the stock of our own natural choice, each from other, lest he imp. ir that stock, and overthrow that

Rock

Rock of liberty, and Free will, which (against both *Supralapsarians*, and *Sublapsarians*) he laboured ere while so earnestly to establish, and so prove to strike upon them, and himself, and the *Divine Attributes*, all at once. But (to remedy all this) here it is not only by *one Man*, who had his personal choice, but by *one sin*, wherein was our natural choice; and therefore let us go on to see what the *Apostle* inferrs, and prefers in such a case.

--- *How much more they which receive abundance of grace, and of the gift of righteousness shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ*] (c. Though Death reigned much both by one man, and by one sin; yet by one Christ they shall reign much more. But then they must be duly qualified, for it is *They which receive*, and that argues no capacity, no ability in them, notwithstanding the blemish of Original sin, for thereby they were under Death's reign, which was spiritual and not corporal only; and held under the power, and utter slavery of Sin as well as Death; rather it convinces them of their privation and impotence, as not having but as they receive;

ceive; yet notwithstanding such empti-
ness and unaptness, being prepared and
enabled by *Christ's abundance*, they
must receive (that is rightly apply)
Grace, sc. the grace of justification by
Faith, and likewise the *Gift of Righte-
ousness*, sc. the sanctification of the Spi-
rit to holy walking: And both these
they shall have, both in their kinds and
measures, sc. *abundance*, namely, for
sufficiency, but not to *supererogation*:
And so they shall reign in life; sc. from
Vassals under Sin and Death, become
Free-men, nay Kings in life, both of
Grace and Glory. And all this not of
themselves, nor for any worthiness of
their own, but by the sole merits and
mediation of *one Jesus Christ*, who is
God all-sufficient, and besides whom
there is no *Saviour*. All these Excel-
lencies of Remedy put together, serve
but to set forth the destituteness and de-
sperateness of the *Disease*.

Verse 18. *Therefore, as by the offence of one Judgement came upon all men, to condemnation; even so by the righteousness of one, the Free gift came upon all men unto justification of life.*

T *Herefore as by the offence of one man judgement came upon all men, &c.]*
 This 18 verse, by the illative, seems (to me) rather to refer to the 16 verse than to any of the rest, and may thence more expressly and peculiarly be supplied. Howbeit the Comparison was there with more precise respect to the Things; but here to the persons. *Therefore then* (the illative is a reduplicate, and concludes so much the stronger) *as by the offence of one man, or by one offence* (whether the primordial Act of his person, or the original stain of our Nature) *judgement* (of the Divine Decree, so wise, so just) *came upon all men* (all common men, and born after the ordinary way of Nature, not the *blessed Virgin*, none but Christ himself excepted) *unto condemnation* (at least from his sentence, and according

cording to our desert) *even so by the
 righteousness* (of his person , natures ,
 offices) *the Free gift* (of grace and sal-
 vation ; *came upon all men* (sufficiently,
 yea , and effectually too upon all the
 faithfull , For he is the *Saviour* of all
 men , especially of those that beleeve)
unto justification of life , sc. that life which
 only the justified , or which by justifi-
 cation only , all men attain unto . And
 here I have only those words of his to
 except against : *The proportion and com-
 parison lies in the wayn emanation of
 death, from one, and life from the other.*
 That certainly it does not , if we look at
 the Comparison no further than as it
 lies in the present verse ; for here the
 main proportion and comparison is be-
 twixt *the offence of one* and *the right-
 eousness of one* , both here and through-
 out the whole Comparison *Sin* and
Grace , the *offence* and the *free-gift* , these
 are the main opposites ; as being the
 principal causes : The other two *Death*
 and *Life* are but secondarily set oppo-
 site , as being but the consequents or ef-
 fects : And this I note that *Christs* excel-
 lency might appear much more in reme-
 dying the cause , than in removing the
 effect only .

Verse

Verse 19. For as by one Mans disobedience many were made Sinners: so by the obedience of one, shall many be made righteous.

FOR as by one man's disobedience many were made Sinners] here concludes the comparison betwixt Adam and Christ; and he says well, this is the sum of all; for 'tis the principal scope of the Holy Ghost, to prefer Christ making righteous, to Adam making sinners. And therefore he saith yet better, we are made much more righteous by Christ, than we were sinners by Adam; and yet best of all, the graces we derive from Christ shall be more and mightier than the corruption and declination by Adam; because the excess and excellency of Christ appeareth much more in taking away the Sin and corruption, than in a delivering from the misery and mortality of Original Sin; And therefore the Apostle (in this case and comparison) concludes it for his greatest glory in making Sinners righteous; above that of making the miserable happy, or bringi^g
E th^g

those that were subject to Death, to reign in life, saying thus, as the sum of all, *as by one mans disobedience (Adams prime and personal Act, with all the affections and circumstances) Many, οἱ πολλοὶ the many* (that is *all* ; for none that ordinarily proceeded out of his loyns are to be excepted) *were made Sinners* (from and in that very Act, not only imputed and accounted, but constituted, and really so effected) And so the very word is used both by St. Paul in this place, and by St. Peter, 2 Pet. 1. 8. and by St. James, Jam. 4. 4. to signify the very being of the thing, and not the bare reckoning only : And we may take his own construction of the word, *put into the order of sinners* ; but then we understand it of the humane and natural order, as by generation and propagation, and the like, but not of the divine and eternal order, *as made such by Gods appointment*. It stranges me still, that he who even now was so vehemently invective against both *Supralapsarians*, and *Sublapsarians*, upon the account of the horrible and necessitating Decree, in this case of Original Sin, as reproving their supposition, *if it be by the Decree* of

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. 75

of God by his choice and constitution, that it should be so, &c. -- and again, -- if God may ordain men to Hell for Adams Sin, which is derived to them by Gods only constitution, &c. -- And now for all that that himself is here, saying, many were constituted or put into the order of sinners; they were made such by Gods appointment; to speak altogether so like them: Is this the way (I pray you) to vindicate the Divine Attributes against them? nor will such an exception save it at all, to say, not that God could be the Author of a Sin to any; but that he appointed the evil, which is the consequent of Sin to be upon their heads who descended from the Sinner: For though Sin and the Sinner may be put for the punishment and the punished in some other places of Scripture, yet can neither be so understood nor accepted in this to the Romans; because the Sin and the punishment both are here noted again and again in their proper, plain, and distinct expressions and comparisons. Neither is there truth (much lesse safety to the Divine Attributes) to speak in such a sense, as, that God appointed (by his Decree) the evil (of punishment and misery) which is the

consequent of Sin, (another's, and not their own) *to be upon their heads* (outwardly and temporally, though the pravity was never in their hearts) *who descended from the Sinner* (and yet descended not Sinners themselves) For thus (though he labours not to speak out) a man of any strict observation, or narrow search, must needs accept him, and the rather, because of former passages to this purpose not a few; besides what necessity is there to wrap in here the divine constituting (either for sin or suffering) where the humane constituting is so evident, so sufficient? It is but asking by whom or by what were many made sinners? and the answer is here already made to our hands, by *one Mans disobedience*, to bid us satisfy all our curiosity in that; and to seek no further for a constituting cause; nor indeed will the whole Analogie endure it; For the total comparison is not betwixt God and Christ, but betwixt Christ and Adam; neither is all this excess, or excellence of State (wherein Christ constituted us, above that wherein Adam destituted us) spoken with any respect to God; but in a direct and compleat respect to Adam only.

So by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous] By the obedience (both active and passive) of one (Lord Jesus Christ, who alone is sufficient to satisfy for all sins original and actual) shall many, even all the Elect, all that believe be made righteous, made (as himself says well) *and constituted righteous*: And we hope he means really righteous (by the Spirits imparting as well as Christ's imputing) else where were all this contrariety of the Comparison? For what excess or excellency were it, to make a thing really righteous, if it was not really sinfull and corrupt before? and *righteous*, that is, not only happy, but holy withall; And therefore the Sinners must needs be understood, not only as miserable and afflicted, but as *declined and corrupted*; and so signifying, we joyn with him (as we have already approved him) in what he says to the end of the *Paraphrase*; Nevertheless we may not doe so as touching the *Consequents* or *Antecedents* thereof; *Therefore*,

shall I be devoted to the Lord Jesus Christ
of righteousness) and shall as he will
in his will be **E**30 (monastery, 14

I. *As to the Antecedents.*

His Position which he intimates in Opposition to the Objection is, *That to deny original sin to be a sin properly, and inherently, is not expressly against the words of St. Paul in the 5 chapter to the Romans.* And for this he hath these sayings; (For as for reasons, he hath more reason than to call them so)

1. He supposes, *the words are capable of interpretation, otherwise than is vulgarly pretended.* Now I suppose that the interpretation of the Primitive Churches, Councils, Fathers, Papists, Protestants, Lutherans, Calvinists, (and the most learned and moderate of them) is of other account with him, than either as vulgar, or as pretended. Yea a reason (or the Maior of it) is propounded by him. *For any interpretation that does violence to right reason, to Religion, to belinesse of life, and the divine Attributes of God, is therefore to be rejected, and another chosen.* True! but then it remains on his part to be proved, That such an Interpretation (as is contrary to his understanding) does so in all, or in some

some one of them at least: And withall, that an Interpretation of his own understanding be not such in all or any one of them.

2. *Sin in the Scripture is taken for the punishment*; what then? it is not so here, nor in more than hundreds of places besides. For as *life and death* go all along the *Antithesis* throughout for the express *reward and punishment*, so doe *Sin and Righteousnesse*, the *excesse* and the *Free gift* distinctly, as the vile *anomie* or *obliquity*; or as the holy *vertue* or *efficacy*.

3. The word *Condemnation* is by the *Apostle himself* limited to signify *Temporal death*; no such matter by his favour, for most certain it is *condemnation* is here opposed by him, to the *Justification of life*; and that signifies *life*, both *spiritual* and *eternal*; and to take away the extent on either part, is rather to make the *Apostle* limit the *excess* on the best part. He must mean *Temporal death*, for *eternal death* did not passe upon all men. Yes, that it did even passe upon all men, from the just sentence; though (as he knows who said) it did not invade all men, to an uttermost Execution. And if he means *eternal death*, he must not mean that it came from *Adams sin*,

but in as much as all have sinned, &c. well corrected of himself, but ill restrained by him. Yea, indeed but he must; and very well he may; not only, in as much as, but in whom all have sinned: Even originally, in his loyns; although not actually in themselves: If all have sinned in him, an eternal death is little enough: But if not, even a Temporal death is too much. 4. *The Apostle here speaks of sin imputed, therefore not of sin inherent; why not one as well as the other? imputed and inherent, though they may be of some diverse consideration, yet are they not of such contrariety, that they may consist together, and that in every kind of sin. As actual sin is inherent, and yet nevertheless is imputed; so original sin may be imputed, and yet inherent nevertheless; will the imputation, which is in respect of a Law, take away the inhesion of the fact or crime, which is with respect to the person? Neither doth the Apostle speak here directly of Sin imputed, but of Sin not imputed. And he knows that hath been construed by many, for man's not so-reputing it, (through want of knowledge, or conscience of a law) although it was* ne.

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. 81

never so much inherent. 5. The Apostle says, by the disobedience of one man many were made Sinners: so that it appears, that in this we have no sin of our own; neither is it at all our own formally or inherently. Whatsoever the appearance may be to us; yet this is of no consequence from the words: Because Adam is here often called one, and one man; not so much to distinguish, or to divide him from us; but to compare and parallel him with Christ. And though it be called one man's disobedience, in regard of the individual, and circumstantial Act; yet in regard of the specific Act of the Common Nature, the common union, comprehension, representation, it was indeed all our act. For so all have sinned and are made Sinners, &c. inherently. The Formality of Sin (whether original or actual) is atonie and obliquity to the Law of God, and so it is imputed but with all its atonie and deformity of our nature, and so it is inherent. Neither was Adams Sin efficiently his person only, but his nature also, and so imputed. And for Original Sin, it is not his person but the External efficient; but the internal efficient was that

law of corrupted Nature, whereby a corrupt thing defected, did beget a corrupt thing like it self, so that, that which is born of flesh, is flesh: But for him to make it *effectively ours as to some purposes of imputation*. Alas! this is to bring God into the business; whose wisdom and justice (no doubt) was efficient to some sad effects of punishment; but then to say, *That it could not be a Sin in us formally*: and notwithstanding the Divine Justice both imputing and effecting such fearfull purposes, as the dreadfull and direfull effects of *Adam's* and our *Original Sin*, oh, *Divine Attributes*! What's now become of your *Vindication*? I have heard of deputation to punishment, but not of imputation without the crime or fault. And if it be so that *the sin can in no sense be properly ours*: how stands this with the Divine Justice, that the punishment should be ours in any sense whatsoever? since even we our selves (such is our natural and humane Justice) kill or destroy not poysonous Serpents, noisome vermin, Savage Beasts, ravenous Birds, or pestilent weeds; but for some natural viciousity, seminally, innately, hereditarily,

intrinsically, inherently, formally and properly in them. 6. To his sixth saying I have spoken before particularly, and say now moreover in summe, That it is not our punishment that can redound to *Adam*, but the guilt of his sin rather that redounds upon us. That in actual, external, and particular Sins, it may be just to afflict the relatives; not only to punish the cause, but (for terrors sake) to prevent the example; but in this original, internal, natural, and universal Sin, it cannot be for terror or prevention to any; since all are guilty, all are punished: That in our relation to *Adam*, we are not only descendants from him in our persons, but participants with him in our Natures, and so may be formally denominated *Sinners* as well as he: And if there be no more contradiction in it, than for every man to say thus, *if I am formally by him a Sinner, then I did really doe his action*: that may be easily said, and not so easie to be contradicted. For what hinders but that a man may say, nay, that he ought to say; I did really doe his action, though not in the personal and external circumstance, yet in the natural and internal sub-

substance of doing; I did really doe his
 action in his loyns, and as a member of
 of the whole body of Nature; Now if
 the Member of a mans body may for-
 mally be denominated sinfull from the
 sin of the whole man: why then may
 not every man be so denominated here,
 being an included Member of the whole
 Body of Mankind? 7. He says, *there is*
nothing in the design or purpose of the A-
postle, that can or ought to enforce any
other thing, than what? than that we
sinned lesse, than Adam, and therefore sins
ned not in him, and that God imputed this
sin lesse to us, than to him. I confesse I can
 see no such purpose in the *Apostle*, and
 doubtesse his design (throughout the
 whole contraposition) is not to lessen
 our sin to *Adams*; but to lessen both
Adams sinne, and the sinne of *us all*, to
Christs righteousness; yea and to lessen
 the Death which both he and we deser-
 ved, to the life that *Christ* had merited
 for us; and to indeed, to heighten his
 Acts and Attributes in all. But thus he
 argues, *If we have sinned lesse, than we*
did not sin in him. To which it may be
 thus answered, the hand sins lesse than
 the mind, did it not therefore sin in the

body? but we see no reason why we should not still say; we sinned in him (naturally though not personally) and as much as he, neither do we look that our sin in him, should by him be lessened to us, but by Christ only, both to him, and to us all.

2. Now for the Consequents of this Paraphrase.

THe consequent of this discourse (he says) must needs be this at least. If it be consequent to his discourse so: but it stands us in hand to examine, whether it be consequent to the Apostles words? but since he will needs impose them on us as Consequences, he will not be angry if I take them up as Inconsequences. For whether so or so, I refer them, Sir, both to yours; and every able and indifferent mans judgement (Conseq.) That it is impossible that the greatest part of mankind, should be left in the eternal bonds of Hell by Adam. Inconsequ. nothing is impossible with God, nothing is impossible that is justly

ly done, and past; we say, not only the greatest part, but the whole race of mankind was so left; and yet all that aggravates it not to an impossibility. For why should it be thought an impossibility, That all by *Adam* should be left in the eternal bonds of Hell; since all in *Adam* had a possibility to be brought to the eternal Throne of *Heaven*? (*Conseq.*) For then quite contrary to the discourse of the *Apostle*, there had been abundance of Sin, but a scarcity of Grace; and the excess had been on the part of *Adam*, not on the part of *Christ*. (*Inconseq.*) The abundance, or excess, which the *Apostle* here contends for, is not with respect to numbers or to multitudes of persons, on either part, but in regard to Grace abounding Sin, and Life excelling Death, and *Christ's* merits infinitely exceeding both *Adams* and our own deserts. (*Conseq.*) So that the *Presbyterian* way is perfectly condemned by this discourse of the *Apostle*. (*Inconseq.*) Though he tell them never so often, yet they will hardly believe him on his own word, till he can convince them from the *Apostles* words perfectly and indeed. (*Conseq.*) Nay, and yet
more

more particularly convince them, when their way of understanding in this point, is singular from the Church of England, or other reformed Churches Suffrage; the other more gentle way, which affirms that we were sentenc'd in Adam to eternal death, though the Execution is taken off by Christ, is also no way countenanced by any thing in this Chapter; (Inconseq.) No? these words (death passed, death reigned, the judgement was to condemnation) these (I say) countenance and confirm the sentence. Again (the Free gift came to justification of life, they shall reign in life by one Jesus Christ) these countenance and confirm the taking off the Execution; were it not thus both for the sentence and for the Execution, where then were all those excesses on Christs part? what excess were it to make those righteous, that were not made Sinners before? what excess were it to justify those to eternal life; that were never condemned to eternal death? Let him look to it, either Christ must be preferred in these Acts and Excesses, or else his Attributes are but impaired. (Conseq.) That the judgement which came from Adams sin, unto the condemnation

nation of the world, was nothing but temporal Death, is here affirmed. (Incon-
(seq. so far is it from being affirmed
that upon right deduction, it is more
than once denied. For it was Death
entring by Sin, and that was something
more than temporal death; It was
Death reigning, and that was something
more than death temporal; It was death
opposed to the justification of life, and
that must be something more than tem-
poral death; It was death opposed to
reigning in life, and therefore must
needs be more than temporal death.
(Conseq.) It is in no sense imaginable,
that the death which bere St. Paul says
passed upon all men, and which reigned
from Adam to Moses, should be eternal
Death. (Inconseq.) Will he allow no
man a sensible imagination, besides his
own understanding? or rather a sensible
understanding besides his own imagin-
ation? Death passed upon all men, that is
eternal death passed upon all men, ac-
cording to the justice of the sentence,
and their due desert. There's one sense.
That Death which reigned from Adam
to Moses, was eternal death, for if
you take the time of Death reigning
to

to be betwixt them two, terminally and exclusively, then was it not so much as a tempotal death passing upon all men; But death reigns not but from an eternal Law, and in and to eternity. There's another sense, yea Death reigned from Adam to Moses, and so onward *until Christ*, and would have reigned eternally over all men, had not Christ taken it off. There's another sense. (Conseq.) *the Apostle speaks of that death which was threatened to Adam.* (Inconseq.) rather of the death which was threatened to the world in Adam, but take it as directed to Adams person, *dying thou shalt die*, Gen. 2. 17. The sacred idiom serves to note the continuity, as well as the certainty of Death: and that was an intimation of the eternity. (Conseq.) *The Apostle means such a Death which was afterwards threatened in Moses Law.* (Inconseq.) well, but who takes a temporal death only? nay, who takes not an eternal death chiefly to be threatened upon the breach of the Moral Law? (Conseq.) and such a death which fell even upon the most righteous of Adams posterity. (Inconseq.) True it fell upon them in part, not that the other
part

part was not due unto them, but that it was taken off by *Christ*. (Conseq.) Upon the most righteous of Adam's posterity, who did not sin after the similitude of Adam's transgression. (Inconseq.) Such righteous ones of all his posterity were never yet known. *Abel*, *Seth*, and *Methusala* were certainly none such; for they and their like (even all the holy Patriarchs) were sinners, as well by imitation, as by propagation; and sinned as well actually as originally. To say that those holy men sin not after the similitude of *Adams transgression*, in that they sinned less; alas! that's but poor; for so even wicked men are said, not to sin after the similitude of one another. (Conseq.) Because in proportion to the evil, so was the imputation of the Sin, it follows, That Adam's sin is ours metonymically and improperly. (Inconseq.) Here's nothing at all which follows a right: for even the first part of his argument is preposterous: By *evil* he intends punishment, and then the consequence is quite contrary, because the sin was not imputed in proportion to the punishment; but indeed the punishment was deputed in proportion to the Sin.

And

And therefore it must follow (by reason of contraries) That *Adams* sin was not tropically and tralatitiously , but even literally and properly ours. But consider what he says in effect ; That God did measure the sin according to the punishment. Now good Lord ! how can the Divine Attributes stand safe to such a saying ? for what Justice is that , that regulates or proportions the sin by the punishment , and not the punishment by the Sin ? In the imputation of God or men , who makes the sin to follow the punishment , and not rather the punishment to follow the sin ? But say his rule stood upon some right foot ; yet how follows his argument from it ? The Sin was imputed in proportion to the punishment ; but the punishment was proper and real , not figurative and equivocal ; and therefore so must the Sin be too : else who can tell what's become of all this proportion ? (Conseq.) *God was not finally angry with us , nor had so much as any design of eternal displeasure upon that account.* (Inconseq.) The way to vindicate Gods Attributes , is , not to pry into them too curiously ; nor to determine upon them too peremptorily :

nor to aggravate them too severely, nor to extenuate them too indulgently, but to believe them and justify them, and magnifie them, so as they are revealed. God indeed was not finally angry with us (his Elect) neither upon our original, nor upon our actual account: And why? because his wrath was so appeased by *Christ's* satisfaction. But was he not therefore so at the Sin simply and absolutely considered? if he had no design of eternal displeasure, upon that account, then he sent *Christ* to die in vain. For *Christ* died to prevent, not the temporal, but the eternal death; Nor was that to redeem us from the mortality and condition of our Nature (for he suffered it himself, and left us to follow him in a conformity) but from the depravation and damnation of it. (Conseq.) *This anger went no further than the evils of this life; and therefore the imputation was not of a proper guilt; for that might justly have past beyond our grave, if the same had past beyond a Adconymic or a juridical external imputation.* (Inconseq.) *O rare consequent! the punishment was*

but temporally inflicted, and therefore the Sin was not properly imputed. As if temporal punishments (whether from God, or men) were the arguments of improper Sins only. But O wonderfull vertue of a bare Trope, or figurative locution ! to qualifie such a pravity, extenuate such a provocation, divert such a desert, yea to regulate such a Justice, or to restrain and limit such a power. If his Metonymical imputation be the same with *Juridical* and *external*, then (me thinks) this proportion should be observed in the proceeding, That as the Sin is imputed but only as it were in some shadow or resemblance of words; so should the punishment be inflicted, and not in any deed or substance. For he that is found guilty, but only in an imaginary *Idea* or picture, ought not to be executed, but only in conceit, or as it were in *effigie*. But I am forbidden to smile, since it is a matter of sighing, in regard the Divine Attributes are so stricken at: For what provocation can there be for Gods universal and continual anger (for such it is against the Fall and original sin) without an imputation of a proper and participating guilt?
where

where the sin is properly imputed, there (he grants) the punishment may justly goe beyond our Graves , that is even to *Hell*. But if there be no such imputation, no such propriety, no such participation; I can see no caule why those evils should passe so far as this present life. Eternal death is little enough, if sin be properly and particularly imputed: but if it be not so, I cannot see but that even a temporal death to all mankind, must be too much. (*Conseq.*) *That as no man ever imposed penance for it (for original Sin) so God himself in nature, did never for it afflict or affright the Conscience.* (*Inconseq.*) By penance surely he understands not private Repentance, but publick Discipline, or that of the Churches imposing; say it were so, the Churches power is to impose the penance for publike, notorious, scandalous and exemplary Crimes and offences: it cannot take cognisance (as no external Law or administration can) of an inward, secret, unsearchable, (though worthily suspected) Sin, such as the Original is. Besides, whose should be the authority in such a cause or case, where all are concluded, and confess guilty

guilty alike? As for the other part, I ask of him, did not God himself afflict and affright Adams Conscience for it, when he was forced to say; *I heard thy voice in the Garden, and I was afraid, because I was naked, and I hid my self.* Gen. 3. 10. And we all feel and must confesse, this afflicting this affrighting was not of his person only, but in his and our Nature also; as woefull experience convinces us all to this very day. (Conseq.) *And why, the conscience shall be for ever at so much peace for this sin, that a man shall never give one groan for his share of guilt in Adams sin, unlesse some or other scares him with an impertinent proposition.* (Inconseq.) What the conscience shall be for ever, is hard for him to say; And for what it hath been hitherto, he knows a Conscience is not always to be argued for pure and free, because it is quiet and still. But what says he to David? did not he groan for it in that Penitential of his? *Behold I was shapen in iniquity, and in sin hath my Mother conceived me,* Psalm 51. 5. And to St. Paul, is this no groaning, ? *Oh wretched man that I am, who shall deliver me from the body of this death?* Rom.

7. 24. Nay shall we not beleieve what he but lately said of himself? *For my part I cannot but confesse that to be which I feel and groan under, and by which all the world is miserable.* Let him look to his Conscience, and see how his words agree first and last; I hope he will not now say it was some *impertinent proposition* that scared him thereunto. (Conseq.) *Why the Conscience should not naturally be afflicted for it, nor so much as naturally know it, I confesse I cannot yet make any reasonable conjecture, save this only; that it is not properly a Sin, but only Metonymically and improperly.* (Inconseq.) Such a conjecture is not reasonable; for if to deny a Sin to be such, were sufficient, because the Conscience naturally smiles not for it, nor yet convinces of it: so many actual sins might easily come to be denied. A strange conjecture for a figurative appellation to save a Conscience. I know the Conscience can Syllogize, but I never knew that she could ever so Rhetoricate with her self: such a conjecture is so far from being worth the sole preferring, that it's not worth the naming, where better reasons are brought forth. As namely,
That

That Original sin her self has blinded and bedulled the Conscience, as touching the true and full apprehension of her self, and of Original sin. That the law and light of nature is exceedingly obscured to all Consciences since the *Fall*. That most mens Consciences are insensible even of their actual and sensual sins; how much more then of the Original and invisible? That men have pulled and seared both their own, and others Consciences, as touching the true sense of Original Sin, by dayly hatching and broaching such *heresies* and errors about it: No marvel then that men are here so insensible; we see it may easily come to passe through natural ignorance and ill habits, without this diminishing glass of a *Metonymical* Spectacle. (Conseq.) *there are some whole Churches which think themselves so little concerned in the matter of Original Sin, that they have not a word of it in all their Theologie.* (Inconseq.) That they have not a word of it, their Theologie is defective to them, that they think themselves not concerned in it, they are defective to their *Theologie*. I could tell him of some Churches that in their *Theologie*

make no mention of the *Decalogue*; do they therefore think themselves but little concerned in it? again some Churches think themselves so much concerned in Original Sin, that they beleeve Souls, as well as Bodies, to be propagated from *Adam*. I spake this of the *Ethiopians* and the *Russians*, no Church but is bound to have such a body of Divinity as may comprehend the whole principles of *Faith* and *Religion*; yea, and to unfold them, and confess them so far as they are revealed in the word of God; but what is it to object some obscure and confused Churches, to the *Catholique universal*, & to the most orderly and eminent Churches of the *World*? (Conseq.) *The height of this imagination hath wrought so high in the Church of Rome, that when they would doe great honour to the Virgin Mary, they were pleased to allow unto her an immaculate conception, without any Original Sin.* (Inconseq.) So far as the Church of *Rome* seemed to joyn with the Primitive Churches in the point of Original Sin, so far also have the Reformed Churches joyned with them, as namely, That Original Sin is, That it

is properly and inherently a Sin. That it descendeth by natural propagation, not by imitation. That it hath in both a stain and guilt. That it subjected to misery and death in all senses and significations: That we are redeemed therefrom by the merits of *Christ*: These are heights indeed, but not heights of imagination, but sound Doctrine. And these she pretended to hold forth against all those who affirmed, That *Adam* lost Original righteousness only for himself, and not for us his posterity: and that by *Adams* disobedience sin descended not upon Mankind, but only a bodily death or punishment. Indeed here she hath also some heights of imagination, as, That Original sin is not only remitted by Baptism, but utterly abolished and quite taken away. That the concupiscence remaining in the regenerate, is no sin. That Original Sin is only in the inferiour, and not in the superiour faculties. That the blessed Virgin was conceived and born free from Original Sin, yea, and many more heights of imagination they have much disputed on among their Scholastics, so that they owe their errors,

not to the simple profession of Original Sinne, but to their subtle disputation about it. As for their opinion of the blessed Virgins immaculate conception, it arose from no other height, but that of their own *superstition*, which is too notorious, in all they can feign or imagine for her, say of her, or doe to her. But I pray God this low imagination, or slender and slight conceit of a *Metonymical, juridical, external-collateral*, nay equivocal, abusive, phantastical imputation, serve not to beget a conceit or presumption of an immaculate conception in us all. I have read of one that would needs deny the immortality of the Soul, with intent to disprove the Popish purgatory; but there are other ways to refute this Error of the immaculate conception, than by abating the truth or utmost truth of Original Sin.

One thing more (he saith) I am to observe before I leave considering the words of the Apostle: This one thing is not so much a consequent of what he would say for himself, as an argument against all such as would argue against him. The ground betwixt both is laid in these last words of the Apostle, As by one mans dis-

obedience

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. FOR

obedience many were made Sinners, so by
the obedience of one, shall many be made
righteous. Some (saith he) from hence
suppose they argue strongly to the over-
throw of all that I have said, Thus, As
by Christ we are made really righteous;
so by Adam we are made really sinners.
This we acknowledge not only to be our
Argument, but our way of *Augmenta-
tion*; and if this standing good be suffi-
cient to overthrow all that he hath said,
then it is easie to be observed to what
purpose he hath spoken all this while;
but to this he hath spoken in his *Addres-
ses*, and to them we can say nothing till
we see them. *But besides* (saith he) *I*
have something very material to reply to
the form of the Argument, which is a ve-
ry trick and fallacy. Strong reason may
be spoken very often without a formal
Syllogisme; and where the matter cannot
be denied to be true and good, 'tis but
a kind of *sophistical fallacy* to stand
too pedantically upon the form. --
But to argue from hence, (as by Christ
we are made really righteous, so by Adam
we are made really sinners) is (saith he)
to invert the purpose of the Apostle. The
reciprocation or conversion of proposi-

tions is no inversion of their purpose, where they may truly prædicate either way. Neither is the inverting of words in their order, always a perverting of them in their intent. *But the Apostle argues from the lesse to the greater.* Indeed the Apostle in his comparison proceeds after such a manner, as from *Adam to Christ*, from *Sin to Grace*, from *Death to Life*; now Compares (Janus-like) look *πρὸς τὸ καὶ ὀπίσσω*, forwards and backwards, and may argue mutually from one to another, Nay they must doe it, else could they not be Compares; now though the Apostle argue from the lesse to the greater, by way of Amplification: yet he forbids not to argue from the greater to the lesse, for matter of reallity, and that is all our Argument. *But we* (saith he) *make it conclude affirmatively from the greater to the lesse, in matter of power.* Will he allow us to doe it negatively? why that will serve our turn sufficiently. Thus, As *Christ's* righteousness was not imputed only: so neither was *Adams* sin; or thus, As our righteousness by Christ was not a *Metonymical* righteousness; so our sin by *Adam* was

was not a *Metonymical* Sin. But (by his leave) we may take liberty to argue affirmatively, as before, & yet offend against no *Logical* Law, or Canon of Comparates, nay and the consequence shall be of great force, even affirmatively, as Thus. As *Christ* did and suffered his Fathers will; so ought we to doe and suffer the same. As God charged his Angels with Folly, how much more may he us mortal men? and from the Apostle in this place. As the Life was a real life, so the Death was a real Death: As the Grace was real Grace, so the Sin was real Sin. But he now assumes the trick or fallacy himself, taxing us for concluding affirmatively from the greater to the lesse in *matter of power* (as what a *Man* can doe, a *Child* can doe; What God is able to doe, &c. the Devil is able to doe, &c.) Whereas our manner of arguing is not in matter of power and prevalency; but for matter of being, and reallity. Now betwixt the greater and the lesse, though there may be a disproportionate *action*, yet there must be some proportionate *being*. And what is affirmed of the greater, may likewise be affirmed of the lesser, and

that in the same kind and manner, although not according to the same measure or degree; yea *very Opposites* and *Disparates* if they come to be compared, are accepted as opposite and different only in their proper forms and adjuncts, but alike, and agreeing in their common Attributes, according to which they are compared; and without which there could be no ground for comparison. And where there is no ground for Collation; there can be no cause for prelation; as here in the Apostles worlds; Take away the reality of Sin, and the Proper being of the offence, and in such a comparison, with what excess, or excellency, can the *Grace*, the *Free-gift*, *Justification*, and the *righteousness of Christ* be preferred thereunto? There's nothing now remaining, but to put it into an *Hypothetical Syllogism*, and so to leave it concluding without all *Fallacy*, according to his own condition, viz. If we be made really righteous by *Christ*, then we were made really Sinners by *Adam*: But we are made really righteous by *Christ*, Ergo.

And thus (worthy Sir) though I cannot presume my self to be one of those
wise

wise persons he speaks of; yet this I presume, that I am not *unwarily perswaded* by this way of arguing; neither can I (out of my simplicity) observe that it is this way, but rather his own whole way of arguing that appears *unconcluding*. But let it be with your own judgement how we either of us appear to you, from what we have said.

2. For the Church.

TO this objection, That his Doctrine is against the 9th. Article in the Church of England. He saith, *I have already answered it in some additional Papers, which are already published.* I would I might have had the opportunity to have seen them, supposing they may contain some kind of Apologie, which might have saved me the labour of an Additional in this latter part. But for what I here see he must give me leave for to speak, as that he may see, That (in judgement, though not in Charity) we are Two. His zeal for the Church
of

of England, seems to be such and so much, that he is protesting before hand, against all that shall but seem to suspect it. But he is indigning him in especial that shall take upon him to tax him for it, in the least degree. I hope this will not overprovoke his patience, only to intreat him; First to reconcile his own understanding to his *subscription*; and then, his own words, to the words of the *Article*.

(*First*) A faithfull subscription of a dutifull Son of the Church, is to submit his understanding, and consent simply unto her suffrage. And to underwrite (with hand and heart) her *Articles* and *Canons*, accepted in their plain literal sense; And not to bring to them, nor yet reserve from them, any other understanding or intention of his own. Laws (we say) are to be interpreted and accepted, according to the mind of the Law-givers; and a promissary Oath ought to be performed, according to the intention of him to whom the promise is made. Now for him to say, *I have oftentimes subscribed that Article*, and, *I am ready a thousand times to subscribe that Article*, and yet to say again:

gain: I doe not understand the words of that Article, as most men doe, but I understand them, as they can be true, and as they can very fairly signifie, and as they agree with the word of God, and right reason, What kind of subscription call you this? with such a liberty or reservation a man might have (without all scruple) taken the *Protestation*, the *Covenant*, the *Engagement*, or an *Oath of Abjuration*. But whom means he by those *most men*? certainly not the Adversaries of the Church, who refuse to subscribe them: But the Sons of the Church, his brethren, who have subscribed them as well as he. The Adversaries, though they consent (for the most part) to the Doctrine, yet they refuse to subscribe the Article, meerly because it is *our Churches*. But as it is the *Churches*, so, we that are Sons and Brethren, doe (with one understanding) simply subscribe it, nor doe we make our own conditions, by way of exception; but we take them all in an undoubted concession. For we also understand the words of the Article, as they can be true, and as they can fairly signifie, and that is even in their literal and grammatical

tical sense. And likewise as they agree with the Word of God and right reason, for so we suppose them in the sense aforesaid. And although we confesse, with him, that the *Church* used an incomparable wisdom and temper in composing her *Articles*, both with respect to *New-reformists* and *Non-conformists* too, notwithstanding we believe her *Prudence* and *Piety* was such, that she intended not so to secure the outward *Peace* of the *Church* against either, as that the *Truth* of it (in either part) might be prejudiced thereby, much less that she contrived any thing in such a *charitable latitude*, as to give license to any, for passing the rectitude, and assidue of *Verity*, or that any one should presume upon his private and dissentaneous opinion, notwithstanding her publique and unanimous Judgement. It was discovered by some of themselves, that when the *Council of Trent* completed her *Canons* of Original Sin, and many particulars of them appearing so consonant to the *Scriptures*, and to *Orthodox* Antiquity; yet they studied to compile the whole with such Artifice, as that notwithstanding they might
leave

leave to their own *Scholasticks* a liberty of disputing and opining what they pleased: But I trust the like shall never be said of the *Church of England*, either as touching this, or any other of her *Articles*; and for my part, I conceive it to be a truer part of a Son of the *Church*, rather to restrain his sense, to her words, than to strain or enlarge her words, to his own sense.

(Secondly,) As concerning this *Article* of *Original birth*, or *Sin*, or *Birth-Sin*, in as much as he says, *if I had cause to dissent from it, I would certainly doe it in those just measures which my duty on the one side, and the interest of truth on the other would require of me.* Hereupon I am very willing to beleeve him on his own word, as liking exceeding well of his ingenious Confession: I have no cause to disagree, and not much misliking his resolution, I will not suffer my self to be supposed to be of a differing judgement from my dear Mother, which is the best Church of the world. Wherefore I shall doe no more (which is the least that can be done in an appeating difference) but set down the words of the *Article*, and then his
own

own words in the *Antithesis*, And so leave it to himself (according to his own promised temper and measure) to reconcile them. Neither wil I so much as once imagine, that he hath less zeal for our *Church* than my self, that so I may spare him the labour of a fruitlesse vow ; *in being all his life confuting me.* Let him but shew how his own sayings are conformable, or not repugnant to what the *Article* saith (which to me and many others seem so contrary) and we two have done, nay are (as we were) in Faith and love of *Christians*, one. But if he goe otherwise to work, I must take the confidence to tell him; he may *be all his life confuting*, and not confute;

Article.

22- Original Sin standeth not in the following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk.

Antithesis.

All actual Sins doe not proceed from this Sin of Adam, pag. 47. -- liberty and not Adams Sin is the cause of all our actual,

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. I I I

actual, pag. 49. -- From the first *Adams* nothing descended to us -- but an evil example, page. 80. not direct Sins to us in their natural abode, -- but principles of Sin to us in their emanation, pag. 81. who by imitation of his Transgression on the stock of their own natural choice, did sin against God.

Article.

But it is the fault and corruption of the nature of every man that naturally is ingendred of the off-spring of Adam.

Antithesis.

The guilt of this Sin being imputed, the same is conveyed to all their Posterity by ordinary generation -- this heap of errors pag. 29, 30. --- Naturally it cannot be, pag. 32. -- not that we bring it upon our shoulders into the world with us, pag. 78. -- if God hath given us a Nature by *derivation* which is wholly corrupted, &c. pag. 96. -- that *Adams* Sin is ours *Metonymically* and impropely, pag. 127.

Artis

Article.

2. Whereby man is very far gone from Original righteousness; and is of his own nature inclined to evil, so that the Flesh lusteth always, contrary to the Spirit.

Antithesis.

The Devil did so descend upon us, that we were left in powers and capacities to serve and glorifie God, pag. 16. -- That by this Sin our first Parents fell from their Original righteousness, &c. this heap of errors, &c. pag. 29, 30. I can by no means approve that by this we are disabled and made opposite to all good, and wholly inclined to all evil, pag. 39. — his nature was not spoiled by that Sin, he was not wholly inclined to all evil, pag. 40, 46, 47.

Article.

And therefore in every person born into this world it deserveth Gods wrath, and Damnation.

Antithesis.

Antithesis.

Original Sin doth — in its own Nature bring guilt upon the Sinner, where- by he is bound over to the wrath of God, &c. — this heap of Errors, pag. 30. It cannot be just for God to damn us, for being in a state of calamity, to which state we entred no way but by his constitution and decree pag. 38. — if it be intollerable to damn Children for the Sin of *Adam*, then it is intollerable to say it is damnable, pag. 59. — Is it against Gods goodness that Infants should be damn'd for Original Sin? &c. pag. 67. — It is against Gods Justice to damn us for the fault of another, pag. 63. Children born in Christ, and not in *Adam*, &c. pag. 74. — born beloved, and quitted from wrath, &c. pag. 75. — born in the accounts of the Divine favour, pag. 77. — if God decrees us to be born Sinners, &c. if God does damn any for that, &c. pag. 94. — if God does cast Infants into Hell for the Sin of others, &c. pag. 96. — It is impossible that the greatest part of mankind should be left in the eternal bonds of Hell, by *Adam*,

dam; pag. 125. — The Judgement which for *Adams* Sin came into the condemnation of the world, was nothing but temporal death. pag. 126.

Article.

And this infection of Nature doth remain, yea in them that are regenerated, whereby the lust of the flesh, &c.

Antithesis.

The corruption of nature remains in the regenerate, &c. this heap of errors, pag. 29, 30. — I can by no means approve that our natural corruption in the regenerate still remains, and is still properly a Sin, pag. 39. — That our natural corruption in the regenerate still remains, and is still a Sin, and properly a Sin; I have (I confesse) heartily opposed it, &c, pag. 49, 52.

Article.

And although there is no condemnation for them that believe, and are baptized; yet the Apostle doth confesse, that

the 5 Chapter to the Romans. 115
that concupiscence and lust, bath of it
self the nature of Sin.

Antithesis:

This will follow, that Adam's Sinne
hath done some mischief that the grace
of Christ can never cure, though it be
pardoned and mortified, yet still re-
mains, and is still a Sin, is perfect Non-
sense, pag. 51. — We are rescued from
Adam before we were born, else Adam's
Sin prevailed really in some periods, and
by some effects for which God in Christ
had provided no remedy, pag. 74. — It
is a Sin *Metonymically*, and just so in
Baptism it is taken away, pag. 103.

*Qui Ecclesiæ renititur, et restitit;
in Ecclesiâ se esse confidit?*

Cyprian de simp. Prælat.

S I R,

BE pleased to know that all the errors
which have been about Original
Sin, have risen chiefly through want of

a. perfect *Definition*, or compleat *Description* of it, some (and they not the least *Hereticks*) have contended against all definition; others have been so various in defining, and so incomplete in describing, that they have administred but matter unto more contention. I am perswaded that out of this place in the 5 to the *Romans*; a perfect *Definition*, or very compleat *Description* might be made, and that such as might comprehend both the name and nature, and subject and derivation, and cause and effects, and remedy; My short time, and shorter abilities will not now suffer me to venture upon it. I have done my Task; and (I hope in some part) answered my Title, and your expectation, such as I cou'd, or could so suddenly make it. I send it humbly to your hands, and through them (if you think meet) to the world. All that I will now say of this Author is this, *That he hath erred learnedly*, far unlike the many senselesse and scurrilous *Hereticks* and *Schismaticks* of this our exulcerated age. And I hope his own learning will let him see his Error. Otherwise, he must think others are not so unlearned,

as for him to impose upon them. Rather than so, I could most heartily wish one more learned in the *Truth* than my self may yet more particularly undertake him. To you, Sir, I need say nothing, you are known. And for my self I need say as little to you ; you know ,

Sir,

Your Minister

Friend, and Servant ,

JOHN GAULE.

FINIS.
